programa final



Encontro Nacional de Produtores e Usuários de Informações Sociais, Econômicas e Territoriais

INFORMAÇÃO PARA UMA SOCIEDADE MAIS JUSTA

III Conferência Nacional de Geografia e Cartografia

IV Conferência Nacional de Estatística

Reunião de Instituições Produtoras

Fórum de Usuários

Seminário "Desafios para Repensar o Trabalho"

Simpósio de Inovações

Jornada de Cursos

Mostra de Tecnologias de Informação

27 a 31 de maio de 1996
Rio de Janeiro, RJ BRASIL

IBGE 60 anos 1936-1996

Uma das maneiras de olhar o ofício de produzir informações sociais, econômicas e territoriais é como arte de descrever o mundo. Estatísticas e mapas transportam os fenômenos da realidade para escalas apropriadas à perspectiva de nossa visão humana e nos permitem pensar e agir à distância, construindo avenidas de mão dupla que juntam o mundo e suas imagens. Maior o poder de síntese dessas representações, combinando, com precisão, elementos dispersos e heterogêneos do cotidiano, maior o nosso conhecimento e a nossa capacidade de compreender e transformar a realidade.

Visto como arte, o ofício de produzir essas informações reflete a cultura de um País e de sua época, como essa cultura vê o mundo e o torna visível, redefinindo o que vê e o que há para se ver.

No cenário de contínua inovação tecnológica e mudança de culturas da sociedade contemporânea, as novas tecnologias de informação - reunindo computadores, telecomunicações e redes de informação - aceleram aquele movimento de mobilização do mundo real. Aumenta a velocidade da acumulação de informação e são ampliados seus requisitos de atualização, formato - mais flexível, personalizado e interativo - e, principalmente, de acessibilidade. A plataforma digital vem se consolidando como o meio mais simples, barato e poderoso para tratar a informação, tornando possíveis novos produtos e serviços e conquistando novos usuários.

Acreditamos ser o ambiente de conversa e controvérsia e de troca entre as diferentes disciplinas, nas mesas redondas e sessões temáticas das Conferências Nacionais de Geografia, Cartografia e Estatística e do Simpósio de Inovações, aquele que melhor enseja o aprimoramento do consenso sobre os fenômenos a serem mensurados para retratar a sociedade, a economia e o território nacional e sobre as prioridades e formatos das informações necessárias para o fortalecimento da cidadania, a definição de políticas públicas e a gestão político - administrativa do País, e para criar uma sociedade mais justa.

Simon Schwartzman
Coordenador Geral do ENCONTRO

Promoção

Fundação Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística
IBGE
Fundação Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatistica
IBGE
Associação Brasileira de Estudos Populacionais
ABEP

Co-Promoção

Associação Brasileira de Estatística
ABE
Associação Brasileira de Estudos do Trabalho
ABET
Associação Brasileira de Pós-graduação em Saúde Coletiva
ABRASCO
Associação Nacional de Centros de Pós-graduação em Economia
ANPEC
Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais
ANPOCS
Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Geografia
ANPEGE
Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Planejamento Urbano e Regional
ANPUR
Sociedade Brasileira de Cartografia
SBC

Apoio

Federação das Indústrias do Estado do Rio de Janeiro
FIRJAN
Academia Brasileira de Letras
ABL
Conselho Nacional de Pesquisas
CNPq
Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos
FINEP
Revista Ciência Hoje

Institutos Regionais Associados

Companhia do Desenvolvimento do Planalto Central
CODEPLAN (DF)
Empresa Metropolitana de Planejamento da Grande São Paulo S/A
EMPLASA (SP)
Empresa Municipal de Informática e Planejamento S/A
IPLANRIO (RJ)
Fundação Centro de Informações e Dados do Rio de Janeiro
CIDE (RJ)
Fundação de Economia e Estatística
FEE (RS)
Fundação de Planejamento Metropolitano e Regional
METROPLAN (RS)
Fundação Instituto de Planejamento do Ceará
IPLANCE (CE)
Fundação João Pinheiro
FJP (MG)
Fundação Joaquim Nabuco
FUNDAJ (PE)
Fundação Sistema Estadual de Análise de Dados
SEADE (SP)
Instituto Ambiental do Paraná
IAP (PR)
Instituto de Geociências Aplicadas
IGA (MG)
Instituto de Pesquisas Econômicas, Administrativas e Contábeis
IPEAD (MG)
Instituto do Desenvolvimento Econômico Social do Pará
IDESP (PA)
Instituto Geográfico e Cartográfico
IGC (SP)
Instituto de Apoio à Pesquisa e ao Desenvolvimento "Jones dos Santos Neves"
IJSN (ES)
Instituto Paranaense de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social
IPARDES (PR)
Processamento de Dados do Município de Belo Horizonte S/A
PRODABEL (MG)
Superintendência de Estudos Econômicos e Sociais da Bahia
SEI (BA)

Coordenação Geral

Simon Schwartzman

Comissões de Programa

Confege

César Ajara (IBGE)
Denizar Blitzkow (USP)
Jorge Marques (UFRJ)
Lia Osório Machado (UFRJ)
Mauro Pereira de Mello (IBGE)
Speridião Faissol (UERJ)
Trento Natali Filho (IBGE)

Confest

José A. M. de Carvalho (UFMG)
José Márcio Camargo (PUC)
Lenildo Fernandes Silva (IBGE)
Teresa Cristina N. Araújo (IBGE)
Vilmar Faria (CEBRAP)
Wilton Bussab (FGV)

Comissão Organizadora

Secretaria Executiva - Luisa Maria La Croix
Secretaria Geral - Luciana Kanham
Confege, Confest e Simpósio de Inovações
Anna Lucia Barreto de Freitas, Evangelina X.G. de Oliveira, Jaime Franklin Vidal Araújo, Lilibeth Cardozo R.Ferreira e Maria Letícia Duarte Warner
Jornada de Cursos - Carmen Feijó
Finanças - Marise Maria Ferreira
Comunicação Social - Micheline Christophe e Carlos Vieira
Programação Visual - Aldo Victorio Filho e Luiz Gonzaga C. dos Santos
Infra-Estrutura - Maria Helena Neves Pereira de Souza
Atendimento aos Participantes - Cristina Lins
Apoio
Andrea de Carvalho F. Rodrigues, Carlos Alberto dos Santos, Delfim Teixeira, Evilmerodac D. da Silva, Gilberto Scheid, Héctor O. Pravaz, Ivan P. Jordão Junior, José Augusto dos Santos, Julio da Silva, Katia V. Cavalcanti, Lecy Delfim, Maria Helena de M. Castro, Regina T. Fonseca, Rita de Cassia Ataualpa Silva e Taisa Sawczuk
Registramos ainda a colaboração de técnicos das diferentes áreas do IBGE, com seu trabalho, críticas e sugestões para a consolidação do projeto do ENCONTRO.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS IN LATIN-AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: AN ASSESSMENT

Márcia Leite Arieira, IBGE/DPE

PREFACE

The late 1980s have witnessed a concern, throughout Latin America, with social policies promoting equity in the countries of the region. In large measure, this concern is related to new definitions of priorities, on the part of governments in the region and multilateral institutions. Such new definitions explicitly recognize that poverty reduction and social equity are to be seen as the main concern of government and multilateral action in the region.

In Brazil and in most of the region, however, concern with economic issues in the last 15 years has overshadowed any preoccupation with the fostering of social development in itself. As a result, the state of household survey data on the socio-economic conditions of the Brazilian at this point in time reflects the strong emphasis of the government on economic policies and a focus on "social variables" as merely intervening explanatory variables or as variables which merely reflect economic development.

The design and implementation of policies to meet social development goals should be supported by timely and reliable demographic, economic and social data on the living conditions prevailing in the region, mostly data from household surveys (there included the demographic censuses, annual population surveys and income-expenditure surveys). Although social policy-making and social policy analysis in Brazil often benefits from a wealth of household survey data that hardly finds any parallel in most Latin American countries, the continental dimensions of Brazil and the complexity of its economic, demographic and social situation, pose a difficult challenge to data collection and analysis and to the timeliness with which data is made available This problem affects statistics in all Latin American countries, from the smaller and less complex, which are also institutionally fragile, to bigger and institutionally more robust countries like Brazil and Argentina. For this reason, all those involved in socio-economic and demographic analysis either in Brazil or in other Latin american countries know that much remains to be done in the updating and modernization of existing data collection instruments, from their content and data entry and processing procedures to their user-friendly dissemination to users.[1]

This paper provides an overview of household surveys in Latin America, concerning
a. their information content, and data availability; and
b. their usefulness as tools for measuring and analyzing living conditions on a timely, comparable and continuous basis.

In so doing, it expects to to bring a comparative perspective on relevant issues that so far have been neglected but need to be considered when discussing the future of household surveys in Brazil and their usefulness for social policy-making and policy analysis as goals in themselves and not as mere side-effects of macro-economic changes.

[1] In the specific case of Brazil, the Brazilian National Household Survey (PNAD) certainly provides relevant data for the understanding of the socio-economic conditions of the Brazilian population and does so in a much more efficient way than household surveys in most Latin American countries. However, it seems to be a consensus among Brazilian professionals that much more is necessary, particularly in terms of information content, in order for demographers, social scientists, social economists and policy makers/analysts to refine the analysis of poverty, social inequality and their causes.

Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

For several decades, academic economists and policy-makers alike expected that the effects of economic investments abd economic growth would eventually "trickle down" to the population in Latin American countries - particularly to the less privileged groups - in the form of a more equitable income distribution and, consequently, of more social justice. However, as early as in 1973, the Regional Evaluation of International Strategy presented by CEPAL in Quito, pointed out that one of the major contradictions in Latin-American development seemed to be the lack of synchronicity between economic development and social welfare in Latin American countries[2]. Towards the end of the 80s and early 90s, not only did it become clear that this was not going to be the case but it also appeared that the effects of the debt crisis of the 80s and the subsequent policies geared to structural adjustment had had a much more adverse impact on the overall social conditions of the populations in the majority of Latin American countries than previously anticipated. Poverty and income inequality increased tremedously and Latin American countries saw themselves in the middle of a crisis that was much more social than economic. [3]

Although at first glance, aggregate social indicators in some countries showed improvements in relation to previous decades (e.g. school enrollment rates, infant mortality rates, and particularly infrastructure coverage rates showed progress), it was argued that such improvements: (a) reflected investments made in previous decades and thus showed the time-lag of returns for social investments directed to the improvement of living conditions in any given country [4] and that quality of social services had deteriorated with lower social spending in the 1980s; and (b) that such improvements still left those countries in a much worse social situation than the one found in more developed countries. The 1994 UNDP Human Development Report shows that, in the region, only Barbados ranks among the top 20 countries, placing it exactly in the 20th position. Uruguay ranks 33, Argentina 37, Chile 38, Mexico 52 and Brazil 65. Canada, Switzerland, Japan, Sweden and Norway rank in the first five positions, the United States in 8th. (UNDP, 1994)

Evidence to support the claims on how tolling structural adjustment policies had been for the poor in these countries was provided by several studies focusing on poverty and income distribution in Latin America in the 80s. These studies consistently showed the effects of adjustment policies which increased the gap between the rich and the poor in most Latin American countries [5]. Analyses of the interrelations between education and income distribution, as well as several attempts to measure poverty and to draw poverty lines in Latin American countries, however, often stressed the limitations posed by available statistical data, particularly data from household surveys [6].

Such limitations range from the virtual non-existence of data to the existence of data which is not simultaneously reliable, timely or comparable over time across sub-regions or between countries. As a result, studies based on household survey data in Latin American countries often cannot go as far as it would be desirable and necessary for an accurate assessment of the different components and faces of poverty in each country. This also sheds doubts on their reliability to set parameters and yield recommendations for policies targeting the poor and aiming at poverty reduction. It is difficult for policy-makers to use such data as a reliable basis for the general characterization of sub-groups of the population to benefit from social investments or to

[2] Cf. CEPAL (1983: 3).

[3] Cf. Morley (1992a, 1992b and 1992c), Bernstein & Boughton (1993), CEPAL(1990).

[4] Cf. Grosh (1990).

[5] In addition to the ones quoted in footnote (2), cf. Cardoso (1992).

[6] This is also true for data obtained through the use of administrative records which, however, will not be analyzed in this paper.

compare the evolution of indicators on living conditions over time or even to identify changes in the poverty profile of the population.

This report provides an assessment of household surveys in Latin American and Caribbean countries with special emphasis in a more detailed analysis of household surveys in 5 countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Chile. The assessment of these surveys will be qualitative and will try to identify deficiencies, particularly deficiencies related to the coverage of these surveys: their content, substance and topics coverage as well as their demographic coverage and the representativeness of their sample design and of the definitions of sub-groups of respondents for different topics. The report will analyze : (i) the range of the phenomena measured; (ii) the scope of the variables used to measure them; (iii) the definitions, content and boundaries of such variables; (iii) the sub-groups of the population defined as the respondents of the questionnaire and of each of its sections. Aspects related to the overall structure of the sample will only be analyzed if they have some bearing on the aspects above.

The report will focus on internal substantive aspects of the surveys, particularly on methodological and/or operational aspects identified in the structure of the questionnaire and sample design[7].. In addition, it will assess the potential of household survey data to construct social indicators and to measure living standards in Latin American countries.

When available, the analysis will be supported by interviewers' manuals containing instructions on data collection procedures. This analysis will help in the identification of areas where improvements can be achieved through more carefully spelled out definitions and more precise instructions to interviewers as well as through the regular scheduling of training and re-training for the survey operational team (there included field and data processing teams).The assessment will be mostly restricted to surveys conducted in the 80s' - preferably in the latter half the eighties - and will always use the most recent material available.

Traditionally, household survey programs consist of two major types of surveys: (a) permanent household surveys which investigate the characteristics of the labor force and occupation, employment, unemployment and income aspects and which, to a lesser or greater extent, may cover other aspects like housing conditions and demographic and educational characteristics of the household members; (b) income-expenditures surveys, which provide information on family budget and consumption and which are predominantly used as the basis for CPI (Consumer Prices Indexes) weights. More recently, two other types of household surveys have been implemented in various Latin-American countries: the World Bank designed Living Standards Measurement Survey (**LSMS**) and the Chilean-born Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional (**CASEN**)[8].

Although the analysis will focus on the predominant model of household survey programs institutionalized so far in Latin American countries - the Labor Force-type and Income-Expenditures Surveys - an overview of other types of household surveys will be provided for countries where a regular program of Labor Force-type surveys has been complemented or replaced by a program based on the **Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS)** or the **Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional (CASEN)** experiences.

[7] The report, however, will not assess institutional aspects related to the strength of executing agencies in the implementation of improvements in their survey program, the adequacy of the existing infrastructure and human power resources to make these improvements operational, their commitment to create and maintain mechanisms to guarantee data comparability, the interaction between executing agencies and policy makers/users of the data or their needs for training and strengthening of institutional capacity.

[8] LSMS is the acronym for the Living Standards Measurement Survey, a World Bank experience that has been implemented with different degrees of success in some African, Asian and Latin American countries. CASEN is the acronym for Encuestas de Caracterización Sócioeconómica Nacional, first implemented in Chile in the mid-80s' but which now has been replicated in other countries. For details on the typology of surveys analyzed in this report, see part 2 of this document.

The decision on the countries to be analyzed in detail was made on the basis of how much light their analysis throws on the comparative advantage in implementing different types of household surveys according to different information needs. Consideration was also given to their potential to illustrate sub-regional differences in the implementation of household survey programs. Bolivia is an example of the interaction between a program of labor force-type surveys and LSMS-type surveys Both the CASEN Program in Chile, which began in 1985, and the 1992 **Encuesta sobre Características Socioeconómicas de las Familias Paraguayas** provide the basis for a comparison of regular labor force-type surveys and CASEN-type surveys.

The analysis considered the following elements: (a) the topics coverage of the survey questionnaire; (b) their frequency and promptness with which data is made available; (c) the degree of integration between different household surveys within a same country [9].

The remainder of this report is structured as follows. Chapter 2 contains an overview of different types of household surveys and their use for the assessment of living conditions and for policy analysis; chapter 3 contains an overview of existing household surveys in Latin American countries, as well as an overall assessment of the countries' strengths and weaknesses in the area. Chapter 4 contains the case studies with an assessment of the potential of surveys for the measurement of living standards and the estimation of social indicators. Finally, chapter 5 contains a summary of issues to be tackled in proposals of reformulation of household survey programs.

[9] The first version of this paper also contained an analysis of the geographical coverage of household surveys in Latin American countries, which, however, was excluded from this version for the sake of brevity.

Chapter 2

OBJECTIVES AND TYPES OF HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS

1. The Use of Administrative Records in Social Statistics

Basic information on the size and characteristics of the population of a given area or a given country have, for a long time, been essential for governmental and non-governmental agencies to plan their actions. Such information can be obtained through two main types of sources: administrative records and household surveys. Administrative records consist of all the official information recorded on a certain population: birth, death, marriage certificates, files of users of public services like educational services, housing services, medical services, welfare services, tax registers, business information on employees hired or laid off, salaries paid, etc. that is, all the information government agencies collect and organize on users of services at a national, state, municipal or even locality level.

Administrative records, however, can only provide information on the users of public services. Statistical information which allows for the analysis of social, demographic and economic characteristics of users of services vis-à-vis non-users, can best be obtained through household surveys. Household surveys are the most widely used source of information for inferences on the similarities and differences of users and non-users of services, while at the same time providing a picture of potential users

Such information is essential (a) for planning improvements in services which already exist; (b) for planning the offer of new services; and (c) for proposing and implementing changes (either reduction or expansion) in services in anticipation of shifts in the population of actual and potential users of these services in addition, of course, to the use of data for analytical, non-policy-oriented purposes.

2. The Use of Household Surveys in Social Statistics

Household surveys are the most widely used instrument to collect social, economic and demographic information on large population groups. They are important instruments to provide inter-censal data on the socio-economic characteristics of a country's population. Unlike population censuses, which investigate certain basic demographic, social and economic characteristics for the whole population, households surveys are applied to a sample of households which are selected on the basis of certain criteria. Household survey samples are drawn from a geo-cartographic basis which represents the area to be covered and which is usually updated on the basis of the most recently available census data. Households are typically selected in a multistage process in which, instead of simple random sampling, the sample frame provides the clusters (usually called tracts or enumeration districts) of approximately the same size of populatio. Clusters are then selected on a probabilistic basis and used to represent the universe of clusters; households are then selected - also on a probabilistic basis - to be representative at certain levels. Clusters and households are selected to be representative of the phenomena the survey intends to measure.

Samples will be representative of the whole population or some of its segments (for instance, the labor force), of geographic areas (the rural and/or the urban areas), of different population/administrative clusters: the country, the states and/or provinces, all the cities or all cities with a total population over X number of people, or some cities and the capitals of states and provinces, metropolitan regions, etc.

One common way of approaching administrative records and household surveys is to say that, while the first provide a good picture of the supply side of certain public and private services, the second will provide a good picture of the actual and the potential demand-side for these same services. They provide information

on which to build demographic, economic and social indicators for identifying trends in demand so that the offer of new services and changes in services presently being offered can be planned accordingly.

The assessment of household surveys on the basis of the criteria spelled out in the introduction of this report must take into account the objectives and goals behind their conception and design against the background of the present needs of statistical information. The program of household surveys which now prevails in Latin American and the Caribbean countries was not originally conceived as a set of instruments to measure living conditions but rather as instruments to measure characteristics of the Labor Force or to set the CPI system of weights on the basis of the average consumption basket for families at certain income levels.

3. Household Surveys in Latin America and the Caribbean

Labor Force Surveys

Virtually every Latin American country has had some activity in the area of household surveys. Of all the countries analyzed in this report only Guyana and Haiti do not have a regular activity in the area of household surveys. The present system of household surveys in Latin American countries dates from the early 60s when, under the inspiration of CEPAL, the ILO and other international organizations or agencies, many countries began household survey programs designed to measure employment, unemployment and certain characteristics of the labor force. In addition to these permanent household surveys (usually done on an annual or sometimes quarterly basis) which are anchored on the investigation of employment, unemployment and the labor force, many Latin American countries also implemented Household Income-Expenditures Surveys at longer and not always predictable intervals (every 5 or 10 years).

The origins of household surveys in Latin American countries can be traced back to a seminar held in Mexico City in 1965, where a study done by the US Bureau of the Census was presented. This study, named Atlántida: un estudio de caso en encuestas de hogares por muestra provided the basis for the Atlántida model, a set of 14 documents comprising all the basic aspects of a household survey. Although the Atlántida model represented an important contribution to countries with little or no experience in household surveys, it was basically a model of household surveys designed for industrialized countries, where the characteristics of the labor market are rather different from the ones found in less developed countries [10]. However, relying on this model and fed by financial and technical support from international organizations (USAID, UNDP, ILO, etc.) and from the Bureau of the Census, many Latin American countries were able to establish and maintain some basic activity in the area of household surveys, particularly labor force surveys.

Originally, both the sample frame and design and the questionnaire content of labor force surveys were directed towards identifying the composition of the labor force, measuring economic activity, searching for differences in the composition of economic activities and variations in the occupational structure in different countries, measuring employment and unemployment and variations in labor income resulting from differentials in wages, forms of payments, benefits paid to workers, etc.

In addition to the main variables related to the aspects above, certain demographic and social variables - like age, gender and level of education - were investigated as variables with an explanatory potential for differences and variations in the behavior of the economic, labor force-related variables. Studies using data from household surveys analyzed, from different perspectives, the degree and extent to which these variables were related to each other.

[10] Cf. Cuadernos de la CEPAL, no. 44, 1983.

Multipurpose Household Surveys

In different degrees of complexity and intensity, household surveys in Latin American countries eventually began to be used as instruments to measure other social, economic and demographic variables in addition to the Labor Force aspects mentioned above. In some cases, these "expanded" surveys came to be designated **Multipurpose Household Surveys**. The analysis of the content of household surveys in Latin American countries shows that they are basically composed of something between 3 and 5 parts which cover: the household and the main demographic characteristics of household members, the main characteristics of the dwelling, some education variables, labor force and income and, sometimes, migration.

These topics, however, are structured around the characterization of the labor force. In spite of the potential relevance of household surveys to characterize the demographic situation in a country, it has often been recognized that in Latin American countries demographic information is not satisfactory: "the publication of basic data is often delayed, available data are incomplete, of poor quality and often not detailed enough to be of some use" [11]

Income Expenditures Surveys

Income and Expenditures Surveys (IES) were designed basically to measure income and expenditures of households, providing the basis and structure of weights for the construction of Consumer Prices Indices. Until the end of the 60s, they only covered certain socio-economic groups and the main metropolitan areas of the Latin American region. With time, however, Income and Expenditures surveys came to be regarded as an important source of information to measure differentials in living standards through the comparison of the structure and composition of the income and the consumption of households, so their coverage of socioeconomic groups has been somewhat expanded. (CEPAL, 1983:25)

In spite of the richness of information they provide however, Income and Expenditures Surveys are relatively limited as a regular source of data for the analysis of living standards. First, because most of them lack national coverage. Second, because even in the few countries where they have been done with a certain regularity, they have been rather spaced in time (in intervals ranging between five and ten years) for their data to be useful for the timely monitoring of living conditions.

Finally, Income and Expenditures Surveys are usually very expensive operations both because of the complex content of their questionnaires and because of the length of field operations. IES questionnaires are designed to extensively cover the composition of the income and the expenditures of the households and their individual members over an extended period of time and this requires well-trained interviewers and effective supervision.

Field operations of Income and Expenditures surveys are lengthy because the reference period needs to be long enough in order to capture: (i) all the inputs to a household and its members in the form of different amounts of income, from different sources, available to the household and/or its individual members at different periods of time within the reference period; (ii) all the outputs in the form of expenditures in the acquisition of goods and services (not only which goods and services are acquired but also in which amounts they are consumed and how often) as well the estimated value (price) of goods and services produced within the household or and the estimated costs the household would have in case certain expenditures were made.[12]

[11] CEPAL (1983:4)

[12] For instance, how much it would cost to rent a house that is actually owned and paid for.

Techniques to gather data on household expenditures may vary from "memory records" (in which members are requested to reconstruct individual or household expenditures for a certain period of reference) to the use of booklets members of the household are asked to fill out, recording all the expenditures made, in each specific category of goods and services, within the period of reference. Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages which are extensively discussed by CEPAL (1983: 25-8).

The use of a long reference period in Income and Expenditures surveys for each type of expenditure is particularly important to capture aspects like the seasonal characteristics of certain types of income and certain types of expenditures. It also guarantees more representativeness of data, regardless of the procedures used for sample selection and for interview/field operations (for instance, whether interviews are done at one shot in the whole sample or whether panels of sub-samples are distributed along the year, with a rotation of panels).

The original conception of a program of household surveys was based on the potential for the integration of data from these surveys at the analytical level. Nevertheless, in spite of attempts made in several countries to integrate Labor Force Surveys and Income-Expenditures surveys in a regular program of household surveys, complete integration has never been accomplished. In addition to differences in geographic coverage and sample frame and design, the more irregular implementation of income-expenditures surveys made it particularly difficult to analytically integrate results from these two types of surveys.

The Measurement of Living Conditions

Assessments of statistical systems in Latin American countries have frequently stressed the difficulties in implementing Income-Expenditures Surveys and in integrating them with Labor Force Surveys in a regular program of household surveys. Budget and human resources difficulties have often contributed to institutional difficulties Statistical Offices find in keeping to the scheduled frequency in the implementation of surveys [13]. These well-known institutional difficulties have recently been joined by emerging needs of more comprehensive data for the analysis of living conditions, for a better demographic and socio-economic characterization of population groups and for identifying elements to explain differences between sub-groups of the population. Such needs increased the awareness of certain limitations detected by users of household survey data: (i) that household survey data did not fully allow for the analysis of living conditions, for an accurate measurement of poverty and for drawing poverty lines to support the design of policies aiming at poverty reduction and targeting the poorer groups of the population; and (ii) that even in the traditional areas which they were originally designed to cover (the labor force, employment and unemployment) they proved ineffective to measure new phenomena, particularly the ones related to the structure and composition of activities in non-formal labor markets.

Having been designed with the formal labor market structure as their backbone, household surveys lacked wider definitions of labor and economic activity. Their narrowness made it very difficult or totally impossible to capture new phenomena like the ones related to the non-formal (or "invisible") economic activities. In addition, they did not provide the range of coverage required for a more refined analysis of the living conditions of the population.

The measurement of living conditions is more inclusive than the measurement of the labor market and of economic activities. It goes beyond the use of income differentials to determine living standards and to draw poverty lines; it also requires a more extended topics coverage than that found in traditional labor-force survey. The measurement of living conditions requires a more detailed coverage of variables which are not strictly related to the labor market and the economic activity. It must cover in detail aspects like housing conditions, demographic trends (migration, fertility and infant mortality among others) and access to services (like schools and health centers), as well as consumption patterns. The measurement of differences in access to adequate housing, education, health services, etc., can add to the analysis of differences between sub-groups within major occupational and income categories and thus support refinements in the analytical understanding of socio-economic inequality, and of determinants of poverty.

In spite of an increasing need of data to support the design of public policies, particularly of social policies, neither the sample design and the representativeness of data, nor the geographic and topics coverage of traditional labor force surveys allow, at this point, for the detailed characterization of population sub-groups necessary for the effective targeting of social policies and for constructing indicators to assess the impact of these policies.

Both the World Bank **Living Standards Measurement Survey** (LSMS) and the Chilean **Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional** (CASEN) represent attempts to deal with the changing needs of statistical information to support the design, targeting and assessment of the impact of social policies. Although different in questionnaire structure, sample design and operational procedures, both the LSMS and the CASEN-type surveys cover a much broader scope of topics and at a much greater length than the traditional labor-force surveys.

[13] Budget and Human Resources restrictions are often cited as the major institutional difficulties in the sustainability of household survey programs in Latin American countries. this is the case in projects of institutional strengthening requesting IDB's technical cooperation, such as the projects in Honduras, Costa Rica and Argentina. Institutional difficulties are also cited in Schwartzman's assessment of Brazil's IBGE.

The focus of these surveys goes beyond measuring economic activity to measuring the living conditions of the population and even to identify the factors which might lie behind certain conditions/situations, particularly poverty situations so that more effective actions can be taken in order to correct them. It thus became of paramount importance to identify links between domains which were seen as more compartmentalized in traditional household surveys.

This means to recognize the importance of analyzing the links between sanitation conditions and morbidity, morbidity and work absenteeism, low educational levels and difficulty of access to schools, or poor housing conditions and high migration rates in certain areas; in so doing, policies could be designed and action could be taken to correct them, improving overall living conditions of sub-groups of the population and in the country overall.

The LSMS includes a much wider range of topics than the conventional Labor Force-type surveys or the CASEN-type surveys. These topics are covered in three different questionnaires: the household questionnaire, which is applied to household members and includes several aspects of household income, consumption and welfare; the community questionnaire, which is applied to key community leaders to assess the conditions of the community infrastructure; and the prices questionnaire, applied to local vendors to collect data on price levels and trends in these prices.

As mentioned earlier in this section, traditional programs of household surveys in most of Latin American countries typically will include LFS-type surveys and Income-Expenditures Surveys. Usually these instruments are structured around different analytical or operational purposes; often their sample structure and design, although deriving from a common basis (in general demographic censuses) differ, resulting in different levels of coverage and representativeness of data.

The LSMS, on the contrary, operates at two different levels - the household and the community - within the same sample frame and covers both household income, consumption and prices with the survey instruments integrated by the time frame within which the questionnaires are applied and by the sample design. In fact, although the LSMS is composed of three different questionnaires, it is often referred to as one single survey exactly because of this integration.

As compared to traditional household surveys, the most distinctive characteristics of the LSMS are: (i) its multisector design allowing for the analysis of determinants of various outcomes; (ii) much smaller samples leading to a focus on data quality rather than quantity; (iii) the intensive use of personal computers at all levels of operations, leading to quick data availability and better quality control; (iv) the flexibility and adaptability of LSMS questionnaires to conform to particular characteristics and policy needs of different countries.

It must be noted, however - and this point will be further explored at a later point in this report - that the LSMS experience has been adapted by different countries, in different modalities: questionnaires have been modified, dropping questions and/or modules or slightly changing their content to adapt to particular circumstances in each country. Modules may have been dropped altogether, their level of detail may have varied or they may have been linked to other surveys applied in the country, maximizing economies of scale in sample design and field operations.

In some countries, the LSMS also had to face financial and human resources difficulties similar to the ones that had previously affected Labor Force and Income-Expenditures Surveys. As a result, the relative success of the LSMS in different countries varies widely and, in spite of an overall assessment of the thoroughness of its topics coverage, the mere replacement of Labor Force and Income and Expenditures surveys for the LSMS should not be seen as an automatic guarantee of better quality data or of sustainability of the information, although in most countries it generally means a wider coverage of topics.

CASEN-type surveys (**Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional**) encompass all survey experiences based on the Chilean experience of the **Encuestas de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional**. The implementation of the CASEN began in Chile in 1985. The CASEN differs from the LSMS in that its purpose is directly policy-related, affecting the scope of its questionnaire and its sample frame and design. The CASEN was conceived as an instrument to measure the redistributive impact of social expenditures and to evaluate current social programs, determining the next steps of these programs as well as corrections and adjustments in their course.

Ultimately, CASEN provides information allowing for the close monitoring of social programs in order to guarantee that the actual beneficiaries of social programs are the segments of the population previously identified as the primary focus of social expenditures and programs: "La Encuesta CASEN constituye una importante herramienta para la evaluación y el diseño de políticas sociales. Permite medir el impacto monetário que tiene el gasto social y los diferentes programas sobre los distintos estratos de la población. Permite verificar si los diferentes programas están efectivamente llegando a los grupos que se han definido como beneficiarios". (MIDEPLAN:1992).

The CASEN is also more "targeted": its questionnaire covers in detail the policies and social programs implemented by the government and its sample frame and design are representative of the regions and socio-economic groups who are the expected beneficiaries of these policies and programs. The CASEN has been implemented every two years since 1985. It seems that its strategic role as the instrument to monitor government social programs and expenditures gives it more institutional support and strength than the average support traditional programs of household surveys receive. Incidentally, the same type of support is provided to the Jamaican version of the LSMS, which was also designed and implemented as an instrument to monitor the impact of government social policies.

When one looks at all the different types of surveys described above, the idea that comes to mind is that of a continuum in which Labor Force-type surveys would be at one end - single purpose - while LSMS and CASEN-type, because of the highly integrated and interrelated approach to the different aspects they investigate, would be at the other end. To a certain extent, the surveys analyzed in this report will be located along this continuum although more heavily concentrated in its mid-section. Few surveys are strictly Labor Force-type and not many are LSMS or CASEN-type in their purposes, at least not yet.

Chapter 3

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY PROGRAMS IN LATIN-AMERICAN AND THE CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES: AN OVERVIEW

The surveys analyzed as the basis for this s4ection are summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3 (ANNEX 1). **Table 1** depicts the situation in each country for which there is information regarding the aspects mentioned above. **Table 2** provides an overview of topics coverage for the countries. **Table 3** summarizes the type and quality of social indicators that can be constructed with data from these surveys.

This chapter begins with a description of the available information on household surveys in Latin American countries summarized in Table 1 and an outline of the categories used in the report to classify household surveys in Latin American countries. It then proceeds to an overview of the activity of Latin American countries in the area of household surveys, trying to identify, in each case for which information is available, strengths and weaknesses of the survey instruments to obtain timely, reliable data for the construction of social indicators and for the analysis of living conditions.

3.1. The Inventory of Existing Surveys

Information was updated on household surveys in all Latin American countries, except for the Bahamas, containing the most recent information found for each country. For some countries not all the information needed for the table was available. Table 1 provides information on:

(a) the date of the most recent population census for each country.
(b) information on Permanent Household Surveys: name of the survey, institution responsible for the survey planning and field operation, type (whether Labor Force, Multipurpose, Living Standards, etc.) and date survey was initiated, the frequency and coverage of each survey, the sample size and last year for which data is available, information on special modules that accompany the survey.
(c) information on Income-Expenditure Surveys: name, date, frequency, institution responsible for the survey planning and field operation, and coverage.
(d) information on other relevant surveys done in the country, like demographic surveys, nutrition surveys, population and housing surveys, etc., including: name of the survey, date, the sample size and its coverage.

In general terms, in what refers to the definitions and the categories used in this table to classify the different surveys, the following applies:

Household Surveys were classified according to whether they were **permanent surveys, income-expenditures surveys** or **other relevant surveys**. Within the first category we included all the household surveys that were part of a program of **Encuestas Permanentes de Hogares: Labor Force-Type Surveys (LFS), Multipurpose Household Surveys(MPHHS) and CASEN-type or LSMS-type surveys**, whenever they show some degree of continuity and institutionalization.

(a) **Permanent Household Surveys** typically include annual, biannual or quarterly household surveys, deriving in scope, content and sample frame and design from Labor Force Surveys. In most cases, they are part of a program of Encuestas Permanentes de Hogares and in some countries the program may have been interrupted during certain periods, frequency may not be so regular and data processing may be slow, strongly affecting the availability of recent information. However, these programs were originally conceived as permanent and regular.

Permanent Household Surveys were also classified according to whether they were **Labor Force-type Surveys, Multipurpose Household Surveys, LSMS-type Surveys** or **CASEN-type Surveys**. The classification of surveys as LFS will be restricted to household surveys with almost exclusive emphasis on Employment, Unemployment and Income Variables, those in which demographic and social variables (age, gender, schooling, etc.) are kept to a minimum and are generally used only to provide some very basic characteristics of the Labor Force. Surveys which were originally conceived as LFS but which throughout the years incorporated demographic and social variables, either through modules or supplements, were classified as Multipurpose Household Surveys.

The category **Multipurpose Household Surveys** comprises all those household surveys which, although originally designed for the measurement of Employment/Unemployment, Income and the characteristics of the labor force, have incorporated social and demographic topics to a greater extent than the traditional labor force surveys. These topics may include education, housing, health, fertility, internal migration, and respondents will not be restricted to the economically active population.

(b) **Income-Expenditures Surveys** comprise all household surveys which are done on a regular basis, usually every five to ten years to measure family income and expenditures. One peculiar characteristic of Income-Expenditures Surveys is that they are more spaced in time and, because they are expensive operations which require a lengthy planning and a lengthy field activity of data collection, they tend to be done at much more irregular intervals than the permanent household surveys.

Analysis has shown that cancellations or postponements of income and expenditures survey are more frequent than cancellations and postponements of regular permanent household surveys, particularly because the IES is a lengthy and costly operation which requires availability of financial resources. Although, ideally, labor force-type surveys should have their questionnaire content, sample size and operational procedures periodically revised and updated, this is usually not done. In most countries, labor force surveys use the same questionnaire from one year to the next and, if resources are scarce, be implemented with minor updating, at longer intervals, in the training of interviewers, for instance. This is not the case with income and expenditures surveys. They are a major operation at longer intervals and always require major updating of the questionnaire in order to account for new items and changes previously detected in both income and expenditures patterns. Income-expenditures surveys cannot count on just the available team of interviewers who apply the questionnaires of regular survey programs and require, therefore, the recruiting and training of interviewers in a process very similar to what occurs at the time of population censuses.

In addition, income-expenditures surveys are mostly used to update the CPI base. As such they need to be complemented by Points of Purchase and Product Specification Surveys, which add even more strain to the costs of the survey. Finally, their data may generate political stress in economic policy decision-making as the result of pressures for changes in that base.

(c) The category **Other Relevant Surveys** includes all household surveys done in a given country on a non-permanent, non-regular, non-systematic basis. Differently from **Special Modules** below, the basic characteristic of these surveys is that they are self-contained entities: their sample is usually designed independently from the sample design of the permanent household surveys, concepts used may be very different from the ones used in permanent surveys, there is no initial plan to replicate it at certain intervals, and in a great number of cases they are planned and implemented by agencies other than the Central Statistical Offices, particularly by NGOs.

(d) The column covering **Special Modules**, on the contrary, indicates those cases in which additional modules or supplementary questionnaires on special topics are tied to the regular permanent household survey both in what refers to sample frame and design, and conceptual integration. Although in most cases they are not done on a regular basis, those modules and supplementary questionnaires may be repeated from time to time in order to provide information for comparative analysis. Not many countries make use of special modules: Brazil and Colombia seem to have used Special Modules and Supplements on a regular basis at least until 1989. Argentina, Costa Rica and El Salvador appear on the table as using them, although not many details are known at this point of their content, frequency, etc.

The investigation of social and demographic characteristics can be done either through special questions in the main questionnaire, special modules within the questionnaire or special supplements (additional questionnaires) added to the main questionnaire. It is not necessary that these modules or supplements be done at regular intervals to characterize a multipurpose household survey. However, to be characterized as multipurpose, a household survey must regularly use modules and/or supplements to investigate a larger scope of demographic and social variables than the ones strictly related to the labor force and must do so for other population groups and not just the labor force.

Household surveys composed of integrated modules based on The World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Survey model and introduced in the countries through World Bank funding and technical support were classified as **LSMS**. Those surveys based on the experience of the Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional were classified as **CASEN**.

3.2. An Overview of Activities in the Area of Household Surveys in Latin American Countries

All Latin American and the Caribbean countries, with the exception of Haiti and Guyana have some form of institutionalized household survey. Guyana has had one round of the LSMS in 1992-93 conducted by The World Bank.

Most regular programs of Household Surveys in Latin American countries were initiated between 20 and 30 years ago: Barbados (1975), Bolivia (1970), Brazil (1967), Chile (1973), Colombia (1970), Ecuador (1969), Jamaica (1968). More recent programs include Belize, Costa Rica (1987), Dominican Republic (1991), Peru (1985). In some cases, however, the programs had a slow start, with long intervals stretching between surveys, like in Ecuador.

Most activity in the area of household surveys in Latin American countries (including population censuses, labor force surveys, multipurpose household surveys, etc.) is conducted by government agencies, in most cases by the Central Statistical Offices of each Latin American country. In some cases, support from outside agencies such as the AID, PAHO, The World Bank and the IDB, has helped countries to increase their institutional capacity to plan and conduct household surveys and to analyze household survey data. This support, however, is still mostly geared to the governmental agencies in charge of the household surveys operations. In some cases support was given to a private organization, such as Cuanto S.A., to conduct the LSMS in Peru, which was implemented with financial and technical support from The World Bank and the IDB (for a Special module).

Sample Frame and Population Census

Population censuses usually provide the frame from which the samples for household surveys are derived. Table I shows that most Latin American countries have done one population census in the last ten years. The exceptions are Haiti, where the last population census was done in 1982, Suriname, where the last population census was done in 1980, Guatemala and Nicaragua which both conducted population censuses in 1995. Of the remaining countries, there is no information available about the date of the last population census done in Barbados. In 16 countries the most recent census was done between 1990 and 1993.

However, the frequency and the time-interval between censuses are not always maintained. Brazil's 1990 census was postponed to 1991, making a decade interval of 11 years, instead of 10. Guatemala's previous census was done in 1981 (a fourteen-year interval to the planned 1995 census). The Dominican Republic had a population census in 1993, 12 years after the previous one, done in 1981.

Predominant Type of Household Survey Systems in Latin American Countries

LFS and Multipurpose Household Surveys have prevailed in most Latin American countries until now, in spite of institutional difficulties and often scarce financial and human resources. Criticisms to these surveys have emphasized that difficulties in their frequency and geographic coverage make their use in policy formulation and monitoring very difficult. Most surveys in Latin American countries are predominantly urban, and often cannot be disaggregated below State or Province levels. Furthermore, the postponement and/or cancellation of major operations like the Demographic Censuses prevents the regular updating of their sample frame and design, making them unreliable instruments to be used in policy-making.

In addition, LFS and Multipurpose HHS have been, for quite a long time now, criticized for the little or no updating of questionnaire content and data processing technology; for substantive reductions and cuts in training programs for interviewers (with its resulting impact on data quality and reliability) for frequent delays in the release of data to the public (causing data to be obsolete and of little use when finally released) and for obsolete and/or rigid methods of data dissemination and little or no analysis of data, particularly for policy-making purposes [14].

Institutional Weaknesses

Many of these problems are a consequence of institutional difficulties. Scarce financial and human resources have caused central statistical offices to constantly lag behind in content update as well as in the modernization of operational procedures which could benefit from technological innovations. There seems to be a general consensus that, in some or most Latin American countries, these problems deepened as a result of the structural adjustment and the public sector crisis in the 80s, when public sector reform (or attempts to promote it) led to institutional difficulties and budget cuts which further hindered the implementation of household surveys.

Argentina and Brazil are examples of this. By Latin American standards both are "rich" countries, countries with larger and more complex economies and higher technical capacity than most smaller, poorer Latin American countries. However, they are also countries in which the need to assign top priority status to macroeconomic policies to fight inflation and the public deficit left little or no room for investments in the quality of statistical data. In the case of Brazil, for instance, the 1994 household survey had to be canceled

[14] CEPAL. 1983: 4-23.

because human resources available had to concentrate full-time in data processing and analysis of the 1992 and 1993 household surveys. The Income-Expenditures Survey only had financial resources to cover its planning stages and was, therefore, indefinitely postponed from its original expected data (1992) [15].

Suriname, at the opposite side of the scale, presents perhaps the most extreme example of the obstacles that can arise to implement a program of household surveys. The country implements household surveys on a quarterly basis. The sample is around 1,000 households, with a response rate of around 50%, which is extremely low. Because the last census was done in 1980 which the results were only published in 1992 and ended up being highly controversial [16], there is no reliable basis to use for the updating of the sample frame. The updating of the questionnaire was done in 1994, on the basis of ILO recommendations, and questions about a second and third job were added. However, although data for 1994 is collected, it has not been processed yet for lack of financial resources. Suriname's last Income-Expenditures Survey, as mentioned, was done in 1968-69. Another survey began in 1987 but was not completed because of lack of financial resources. An attempt to conduct a mini household budget survey in 1993-94 was also unsuccessful [17].

3.3. Frequency

The frequency of household surveys varies widely. In Argentina, Belize, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Uruguay and Venezuela they are done twice a year. In Barbados, Colombia, Suriname and Mexico they are quarterly. In Colombia, however, they are done on a quarterly basis only in urban areas; frequency in rural areas is variable. In Jamaica, the regular program of household surveys (LFS-type) has been implemented since 1968 and is conducted on a quarterly basis. Jamaica, however, has also been successfully conducting, since 1988, the **Jamaican Survey on Living Conditions (LSMS-type)** on an annual basis as part of the LFS system.

Chile presents a somewhat different case in that its **Programa Integrado de Encuestas de Hogares (PIDEH)** is composed of one quarterly survey (the **Encuesta Nacional de Empleo**, two monthly surveys (the **Encuesta Nacional de Mano de Obra y Remuneración** and the **Encuesta Ocupacional**) and one annual survey (the **Encuesta Ocupacional y de Ingreso**). The **Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional (CASEN)**, however, is conducted every two years. Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay and Peru conduct annual surveys. Since 1980, however, Brazil has also been conducting a Monthly Labor Force Survey in 6 metropolitan regions.

Dates of survey implementation are not available in all cases. Among the countries for which information is available, the Argentina's survey is done in May and October while in Honduras it is done in March and September. In Brazil it is done in the fourth quarter of the year. In Costa Rica, it is done in July and in Panama in August. Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala and Paraguay have their surveys at variable dates.

[15] Schwartzman: 1995.

[16] Among other issues, controversies concern the results vis-à-vis internal and external migration. There are indications that the country as a whole lost population to international emigration and internal migration changed the demographic outlook of regions in the country.

[17] Information provided by Jacques Anas.

3.4. Special Modules and Other Relevant Surveys

Some countries have used – with higher or lower degrees of continuity – special modules to investigate socio-demographic topics that may be of interest to policy making and policy analysis. Initiative to introduce these modules may come from government agencies, universities or specialists interested in maximizing the benefits of household survey operations, particularly when they are done in a national scale.

The potential of household surveys to gather additional information on topics other than the ones they were originally intended to cover varies widely as a result of their sample design and framing. In the absence of surveys specifically designed to cover socio-demographic aspects of the population, however, traditional household surveys have proven to be very useful, particularly when proponents are aware of the limitations imposed by their sample frame.

Of all Latin American countries covered in this report, at least Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and Ecuador and Jamaica have worked with core questionnaires and rotative special modules in regular household surveys programs. In Ecuador, a special module on Health was done in 1990, but no details are available as yet. Colombia and Brazil seem to be the countries to have most extensively and widely used this instrument.

Colombia's modules are designed to measure specific topics and issues of interest for policy-making and are usually requested by other government agencies. In the past, these modules have included Housing and Transportation (1978); Transportation (1980); Housing (done annually since 1986); Fertility (1971, 1972, 1977, 1978 and 1980); and Informal Sector (1984, 1986, 1989, 1990).

In the case of Brazil, special modules were done regularly between 1973 and 1989, with different degrees of success. Implemented as additional questionnaires applied to the whole sample or, in some cases, to a sub-sample of respondents to the main questionnaire, these modules covered: Labor Force and Fertility (1973), Race, Occupational Structure and Social Mobility (1976), Housing (1977), Health (1981), Education (1982), Labor and Social Security (1983), Fertility (1984), Living Conditions of Children in Metropolitan Areas (1985), Contraception, Access to Social Programs and Community and Union Participation (1986), Social and Political Participation (1988) and Labor Force and the Formal and Informal Labor Market (1989 and 1990).

The 1985 survey was done only in metropolitan regions to gather information on living conditions of children and their families, particularly in the lower-income groups. The 1986 survey consisted in fact of 3 modules, one on each theme. The Fertility module was applied to a sub-sample of women between 15 and 54 years of age. Data obtained in the module on Access to Social Programs, however, proved to be of little use considering the little representativeness of responses.

Most Latin American countries have had experiences in the category of "Other Relevant Surveys" which includes non-regular household surveys, usually done only once, mostly covering health, nutrition and demographic aspects. Contrary to the regular programs of household surveys which are usually implemented by the Central Statistical Offices and, in a few cases, by the Ministry of Planning, these other surveys are often implemented by Non-Governmental Organizations. Particularly in countries with little or infrequent/irregular activities in the area of household surveys, such activities fill in a gap for statistical information, particularly information on socio-demographic aspects of the population.

Such is the case of the Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud, done in the Dominican Republic in 1986, of the Encuesta Nacional de Fecundidad in Ecuador in 1979, of the National Food and Nutrition Survey done by PAHO in Guyana in 1976 or of the Rural Social and Economic Survey also implemented in Guyana in 1994. Mexico had a National Survey on the Informal Economy in 1991 and Panama had, among others, a National

Survey on Mothers and Children in 1984 and a National Survey of Nutrition in 1980, in addition to a National Survey on Maternal-Child Health and Family Planning, recently done in 1993.

Particularly important are experiences with the LSMS in several countries. In Bolivia, the LSMS experience was used as the basis to widen the scope of the labor force-type household survey that had been implemented prior to 1989. In Guyana, an LSMS was done in 1993 and a 1996 round in under discussion, although the survey itself cannot be classified as institutionalized. Ecuador has been conducting an Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida since 1994 (repeated in 1995 and planned for 1996), based on the LSMS and with support from The World Bank and The United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Nicaragua conducted an LSMS in 1993 with support from The World Bank and has been discussing the possibility of doing a second round in 1995. Honduras and Paraguay both have plans for an LSMS in 1995, with the support from The World Bank.

Panama also did an LSMS in 1983-84 in Panama City and the district of San Miguelito. Trinidad and Tobago did an LSMS in 1992 and Peru has had 4 rounds of the LSMS, in 1985/86, 1990 and 1991, the last one under the administration of a private research institute. Venezuela also conducted a Social Survey in 1992 which was originally planned as an LSMS but was implemented in a substantially modified form. In Brazil an LSMS pilot is under way.

Of all the LSMS experiences so far in Latin American countries, the most successful one has been Jamaica, where the LSMS is done as a second stage of their Labor Force Survey with a questionnaire designed for the measurement of specific policy/program aspects of interest for the Jamaican government and the Planning Ministry. The government's active interest in using the LSMS data for the design and monitoring of social policies is probably the reason why the LSMS has been so successful in that country as compared to the LSMS experience in other countries [18].

In 1993 Colombia began a new experience with the CASEN, Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica and with the Encuesta de Calidad de Vida Nacional y de Calidad de Vida in Bogota. The last one in particular was seen as a natural outcome of a series of studies and analysis that had been implemented since the mid 80s, in an attempt to refine and more precisely define poverty lines and poverty indicators, on the basis of a wide set of indicators on living conditions.

In 1992, in addition to its program of household surveys and to its plans for an Integrated Household Survey in 1996 largely modeled after the LSMS, Paraguay conducted a "Encuesta sobre características socioeconómicas de las familias paraguayas", with a national sample of 5,059 households in urban and rural areas of the country.

The implementation of special modules, although not widespread in Latin American countries, can be very useful, particularly in those countries where not much social information is available through the regular program of household surveys. The definition of a basic plan of modules to be covered at regular intervals could fill in the gap for socio-economic information in many countries. A major drawback in the implementation of modules, however, is that they often do not allow for an integrated analysis of multiple factors explaining poverty and differentials in socio-economic conditions, a problem which can be solved through a sample design that takes such needs into account.

[18] Jamaica also combines the implementation of the LSMS, which is household based, with a facility-based survey in Education, thus covering users and non-users or potential users of educational services.

3.5. Household Surveys in Latin-American and the Caribbean Countries: Topics Coverage, Frequency and Degree of Integration in Programs of Surveys

The aspects which are investigated in household surveys, particularly labor force surveys, and the concepts and definitions of the variables which measure them, have been agreed upon by the different international organizations that have supported initiatives to implement household surveys in member countries, like the ILO, CEPAL and the more inclusive United Nations network of agencies involved in development work. Such definitions were primarily intended to provide comparability among different countries and have evolved through the years in an attempt to keep in pace with economic and socio-demographic changes that affect the organization of labor, income structure, and the socio-demographic characteristics of different countries.

Consistency, over time, in content (that is, definitions, concepts and classifications), geographic coverage and frequency are important aspects that provide comparability among surveys. In addition, the integration of different instruments within a same program of surveys - which can be mostly accomplished through the use of standard definitions and concepts, the same sample frame and the same geographic coverage - had advantages that go beyond comparability. They represent economies of scale in the sense that a much wider range of aspects can be investigated at regular intervals, maximizing the chances for better and more effective analyses and for comparisons between countries and between regions within a same country.

3.5.1. Basic Ideal Coverage of Topics in Household Surveys: Input, Access, Output and Putcome Indicators

In addition to data on the characteristics of the labor force and on the structure and composition of income which form the basis of labor statistics, the measurement and analysis of living conditions requires household surveys to provide information on several social and demographic aspects. Housing and Sanitation, Education, Health, Fertility, Mortality and Migration are the basic aspects which should form the core of any household survey. Data on Expenditures and Consumption - in special food consumption are also extremely relevant since they provide an excellent proxy for the measurement of income and for drawing poverty lines.

Of course the ideal content of household surveys is highly dependent on what is being measured and for what purposes. Their potential for the implementation of effective systems of social indicators is, of course, dependent on these aspects. In general terms, as this report pointed out earlier, a trend has been set in the last decade for the measurement of living conditions as well as for the monitoring of social programs and social investments.

Two key issues feed this trend: (i) the need to assess baseline social conditions, particularly poverty and social inequality, identifying target geographic areas/population groups to benefit from social investments and programs; and (ii) the need to obtain reliable data to monitor the impact of investments and how effectively they reach target groups.

In general terms, these goals can be translated into indicators which cover the living conditions and measure the means or resources applied to the programs, projects and services, how effectively programs, projects and services reach the population and their outcome (the impact of programs, projects and services on the well-being of the target-population). Indicators can be classified according to the elements and components they measure as input, access, output and outcome indicators (cf. Vos, 1992). This classification can apply overall to indicators on socio-economic conditions in general as well as to indicators in specific sectors in which investments and programs are heavily concentrated.

Input indicators provide a measure of the required financial and human resources conditions that need to be met,, as well as of basic programs designed for the satisfaction of socio-economic needs; they mostly refer to the institutional conditions for making certain services available at a certain level of efficiency

and cover both public and private spending. At the public spending level, input indicators basically refer to the amount of financial, human and material resources required to deliver certain services; in the case of education, it will refer to a country's expenditures with education, the number of teachers, classrooms and classroom material available to students, etc. In the case of health, the portion of the budget allocated to health, the number of doctors, hospitals, hospital beds, etc.

Input indicators, however, also cover some basic conditions at the private level of families or households, like the sanitary conditions of households which are essential for the sustainability of health programs designed for the improvement of health conditions, the density in households which provides a measure of the environment in which children reached by educational programs will be able to study and perform their school tasks, etc.

Access indicators measure physical, material and financial constraints (or lack thereof) to the access and useof services and programs by the population groups they are intended to reach. Geographical distance to school or to a hospital or health center, financial difficulties on the part of the family to buy the required books or the uniforms for their school-age children, or to pay bus fares or simply to be able to send their kids to school instead of needing them to work to in order to generate income for the family are all important elements to consider when discussing education indicators. Difficulties to see a doctor or nurse, long waiting lines in health centers, expensive prescriptions and the need to pay for certain exams may all be discouraging factors for some to seek health care when needed.

Output indicators measure the results of investments in certain areas. They measure the results or the impact of programs and policies designed for the improvement of living conditions or for improvements in particular areas like health, sanitation, housing, education, public safety, etc. Output indicators constructed from household survey data generally show changes and evolution in overall living conditions of a population and/or in certain areas.

Effective indicators will provide effective measurements of improvements or deterioration in living conditions overall or in certain specific areas. When investments, programs and policies in Education and Health, for instance, are successful, this should be reflected in the improvement of coverage indicators for these areas: higher school enrollment rates, a higher percentage of school-age children in school, higher literacy rates, higher average number of years of schooling for the whole population, a more skillful and knowledgeable workforce, etc. as well as lower infant and child mortality rates, higher life expectancy rates, lower morbidity rates, etc.

The improvements in conditions shown in output indicators, however, may have an impact in areas that are not directly related with the ones originally being measured. **Outcome indicators** measure externalities that go beyond the specific outputs of particular projects and sectors, affecting other areas and improving overall living conditions of the population. Better sanitation conditions will show not only in indicators of sanitation coverage of households, but also in health indicators, e.g. a decrease in diseases and deaths resulting from poor sanitary conditions in the households. Improvements in education may eventually affect fertility rates and even morbidity rates. Together with improved health conditions, improvements in educational conditions of a country will certainly have an impact on overall productivity, as a result of a better educated and healthier labor force, of less work and school absenteeism due to health problems etc.

Input and access indicators will measure the elements and means available to provide social programs and/or obtain social services, while output and outcome indicators will measure the more immediate (output) or more comprehensive (outcome) impact of programs on the well being of the population. One might consider that educational policies designed to increase the educational level of a population (the expected output) will be based on programs which require the input of a sufficient number of teachers, schools, school books and, in general terms, a certain amount of financial resources to guarantee that these elements will be in place and working properly for the goals of the program.

Household surveys can be extremely effective instruments to obtain indicators, particularly access, output and outcome indicators. From this point of view, of all the models of surveys analyzed in this report, the LSMS is the one that provides the wider coverage of topics at a level of complexity which allows both for the analysis of living conditions in general, the impact of public investments in areas like Health and Education and of the externalities of investments in social programs and projects -the impact that investments in one area like Nutrition or Sanitation can have on others, like Health and Education. The LSMS is more complete than both the CASEN and traditional labor force surveys in that it provides good coverage for the construction of input and output and even outcome indicators in addition to access indicators [19]

The analysis of the living conditions in any given country requires information on specific socio-geographic situations (urban and rural living conditions), representative at different levels (national to state/province to municipality) at different socio-demographic levels: at the level of the living conditions of the population as a whole, at the level of living conditions of socio-economic strata, of families, as well as of sub-groups of the population, particularly the ones which have traditionally been target by social policies like children, youngsters and women, native populations, etc.. It should allow for the monitoring and identification of differences in living conditions of specific ethnic/racial groups and age groups (seniors, women, children, for instance), between areas (rural and urban) and across different regions within a same country.

In addition to providing information for comparative analysis along the lines described above, household surveys can be an efficient source of information on the demand (actual or potential) for certain services in the short run or in the long run. For instance, knowledge about trends in fertility rates, and life expectancy rates, are crucial for assessing whether the welfare system may become burdened overtime by a smaller percentage of contributors, or that there will be an increase in the demand for certain medical services to care for the elderly , or that school enrollment rates at the primary and secondary levels may drop (or rise).

Household survey data can assist in accurately measuring the actual coverage of public services and the lag between such coverage and the demand for such services: housing, education, health, sanitation and utilities are some of the areas in which indicators based on household survey data will provide a good measure of differentials in the access to such services which may imply relative differences in living conditions among different population groups.

Ideally, household surveys should provide data to cover input, access and output indicators. Important aspects to be included in household surveys are:

a) Housing: Characteristics of the Dwelling

The way people live is a crucial dimension to assess the well-being of a population. Indicators of well being can be constructed with information on the physical characteristics of the dwellings [20], there included aspects like property situation, size in sq. footage and/or in number of rooms and number of rooms used as bedrooms, type of material used in the exterior and the interior of the dwelling, availability of tap water and bathroom inside the dwelling. Investigation should also cover the source of tap water, as well as the facilities

[19] Access indicators are particularly well- covered in CASEN-type surveys.

[20] The distinction between dwellings and households is a distinction between a physical unit and a socio-economic and demographic unit. The units of investigation in household surveys are in fact dwellings, here defined as a groups or rooms or a single room occupied by a family or a group of people living together. The concept of household implies one family or a group of people living together in one dwelling. In fact, an additional refinement can be made if households are defined as consisting of one family or two or more families sharing the same living quarters.

for disposal of deject; assessing the connections to public works (public water and sewerage services. In addition, the use of kitchen and bathroom facilities - whether their are exclusive of the dwelling or shared by other dwellings - are important indicators of the sanitary conditions available to household members. Measures on the access to certain services like cooking fuel, electricity (both inside the house and in the streets) and telephone, to certain basic equipment like cooking stoves and refrigerators, and to amenities such as t.v., stereo and radio sets, provide good indicators of relative differentials in the overall well-being of population groups.

b) Characteristics of the Population: the Investigation of Basic Demographic Variables

These include age and gender, as well as ethnic/racial origin and marital status, the situation of each individual within a given household and/or family in relation to the head of that unit. Demographic characteristics of all members of a household are essential in the characterization of the population and sub-groups in the population and how these groups are distributed concerning each one of the other aspects listed here (housing conditions, economic activities, education, health, etc.).

In addition, the identification of migratory patterns of the population is relevant for the general demographic characterization. The information on movements of the population across areas (rural and urban) as well as across and between regions, is an important source of identification of factors affecting the attraction and expulsion of population. This information is essential for a more effective planning of size and types of infrastructure and social services which will be needed in attraction zones as well as of more effective policies to correct situations which represent potential expulsion factors in other areas.

c) Occupation and Income

We may group these two topics within a larger one named Economic Activities. Information to measure the economic activities of a given population should include participation in economic activities, income derived from economic activities and time spent on them. They should be flexible enough to allow for the inclusion of less conventional economic activities which are not always strictly employment and may be performed within the household as well as to differentiate the inactive from the unemployed (who are actively looking for a job), as well as to identify underemployment. Traditionally, labor force-type household surveys cover employment inquiring about the main job within a reference period of one week and sometimes about a secondary occupation. In some cases, they cover a reference period of one week for employment and 1 month for income. The LSMS covers the last 7 days and the last 12 months in order to get a more accurate measure of annual household income. Often they also include search for a job or for an additional job.

A more accurate picture of the labor force, the movements within the labor market should include the coverage of the main activity of respondents as well as of secondary activities. A more accurate picture of income should include labor and non-labor income, like pensions and benefits, capital income, income from rent, interest and dividends, transfers as well as, of course, the composition of and amounts in each category.

As will become clear below, traditional labor force surveys are mostly designed with urban employment conditions in mind. Household surveys in rural areas, however, require a much different questionnaire, allowing for the coverage of seasonal employment, the use of land, crop production and ownership of livestock and production, production for household consumption, structure and composition of household income, among others.

d) Education

Education and Schooling are important topics to characterize not only the Labor Force but the population as a whole, providing a relevant measure of the degree in which a population or sub-group of the population has (or will eventually acquire) the capacity to pursue the means which will allow for the satisfaction of other basic needs. Because of the role educational level plays on aspects like the health and nutritional conditions of a population, in addition to its relation to more strictly economic aspects like access to better jobs and higher income, the investigation of educational variables in household surveys is crucial in the characterization of living conditions.

Household surveys can be efficient instruments to obtain information allowing for the construction of input, access, output and outcome indicators in Education [21]. Output indicators to be obtained from household surveys include participation in the educational system (enrollment and attendance to school), of performance (grade progression and highest grade and level of education completed) and of accessibility (the reasons why sub-groups of the population who should be attending school - children, for instance- are not). Literacy rates, average years of schooling, adequacy age/grade, and the degree of difficulty in the access to a school are some relevant indicators in this area. Input indicators will include private expenditures with education for instance, while output indicators include schooling rates for the population as a whole, for the school-age population as well as for particular age groups and levels.

f) Health

The investigation of Health in Household Surveys typically includes the investigation of morbidity plus the access to health services, through the investigation of the use of health services associated with an episode of illness or injury. Like in Education, the investigation of Health should include the demand and the supply sides of Health Conditions and provide input and output indicators for the assessment of Health conditions. Expenditures with Health, at the level of domestic and government budgets, availability and accessibility of health services should be investigated, as well as morbidity and the preferred type of care for different socio-economic groups. The investigation of health in household surveys should include indicators to analyze the links between health and work productivity, including remuneration and health and school performance, that is, indicators to measure the impact of health conditions on work and school productivity, the impact of sickness and injuries on work and school activities. Such an investigation should also include expenditures with health services, health insurance, etc.

The assessment of health conditions should also include aspects pertaining to vulnerable groups in the population and which are often the target of public policies in the area of Health: women - particularly women in the child-bearing years - and children. Proper pre-natal care as well as breastfeeding can dramatically reduce childbirth-related women's death rates as well as infant mortality rates. Immunization and the knowledge of oral rehydration techniques could reduce the incidence of fatal illnesses and ailments (like measles, rubeola, diarrhea, among others) in infants and school-age children.

Information of the degree to which existing policies and programs are reaching different areas and population groups is essential for the design of effective health programs.

[21] An analysis of the uses of input and output educational indicators can be found in Vos, 1995. It is important to remind readers, however, that most input indicators are available from administrative records and, in this sense, an attempt to make household survey data and administrative data compatible might greatly improve the quality of social statistics in general.

g) Nutrition

Information on the structure of household expenditures with food is relevant for assessing whether basic nutritional needs of the population or of population sub-groups are being met. Nutritional levels constitute an important measure of its well-being, particularly during infancy and early childhood and may translate differentials in the access of families to healthy and balanced diets as a result of income, of educational level or of both. Nutritional aspects can be measured through different techniques: (i) the measurement of the actual consumption of foods in households, matching actual consumption to the ideal consumption according to age levels, gender, levels of physical activity, etc. and (ii) through anthropometric measures. Anthropometric measures are particularly effective and more reliable than food-based estimates to determine the nutritional status of younger children.

h) Consumption

Although income and expenditures surveys have mostly been used to update the CPI weights, data from these household surveys are very useful for the general assessment of the well-being of population groups. Data on income and consumption provide a sound basis to refine the analysis of differences among socio-economic strata that are not solely based on income but on the structure of household budgets, an expression of differences in budgeting strategies characteristic of different stages in the life cycle of a family, or of different choices concerning the use of income: the ability of households to provide for the basic needs, like housing, food and clothing, of family members, and the differences in the chances to provide for recreation and leisure, investments, etc. express socio-economic differences that may be hidden when only income is taken into account.

3.5.2. Topics Coverage in Household Surveys in Latin American Countries

A. An Overview

Labor Force-type Surveys in Latin American countries hardly ever investigate all the topics described above but may include a fair amount of them. An overview of topics coverage in household surveys in Latin American countries is provided in **Tables 2 and 3 (Annex).** Table 2 provides a general information on major blocks of topics coverage, while Table 3 summarizes dimensions and variables covered within each major topic [22].

Both tables contain information from the last existing household survey in the regular household survey program in each country, whenever the country had such a program. Table 2 presents the coverage of regular programs of household surveys as a baseline picture - or a starting point of analysis - for Latin American countries [23]. This gives a unique measure (in this case, the content of the surveys) to compare

[22] The Bahamas, Belize, Costa Rica, Guyana, Haiti, Mexico, Suriname and Trinidad & Tobago are not included in this analysis because no questionnaire was available. For Nicaragua, documentation was available but not the questionnaire, which made it difficult to access variables which include listing of items, like existing equipment in household, expenditures per items, etc.

[23] In addition, in the cases of countries where supplementary questionnaires or modules are regularly done, the table only uses the content of the basic questionnaire, concentrating thus on the comparability of the structure of questionnaires and of the topics covered.

countries. Because of the LSMS's wide coverage of topics, using information from their implementation at this point might give a false picture of the situation, particularly in Type I countries, where the incidence of LSMS experiences is higher than in the two other types of countries [24].

In Table 2, information from LSMS-type surveys was used either when the country had no regular program of household surveys or when there was no information available on such program. The exception is Jamaica: because the LSMS has been a rather successful experience in that country and because it is institutionalized and integrated to the operational structure of the regular Labor Force Survey, information on Jamaica also includes the LSMS coverage [25].

Table 3, however, uses a different approach: in addition to information on the coverage of the last household survey available for a given country, it provides information on LSMS- or CASEN-type surveys done in the country regardless of their degree of institutionalization. This way, it provides the comparison of coverage of topics and dimensions covered within topics for each country regarding both the regular household surveys program and an alternative or complementary program like the LSMS or CASEN.

Table 2 shows that there is not much difference between Latin American countries with regular programs of household surveys concerning overall topics coverage of regular household surveys. This may indicate that differences between countries will lie on their relatively different institutional capacity in the following areas: (a) the relatively lengthier or more summarized composition of questions covering each topic; (b) the frequency and timeliness of data collection and processing, meaning the capacity of countries to keep to their schedule of household surveys operations, both from the point of view of field operations and from the point of view of data processing operations; (c) the consistency and quality of data obtained.

The analysis of the surveys points to some degree of correlation between topics coverage, frequency and the degree of integration of surveys in a program. More integrated surveys like the LSMS and CASEN-type are also the ones with the most extensive coverage of topics. Frequency has always been a problem, but it seems to have a more dramatic impact in countries where programs are not integrated and when Income-Expenditures Surveys are done at longer intervals.

On the other hand, changes in the extent to which all basic variables in a topic were covered are very common in the surveys analyzed. Most often, changes are done in an attempt to improve data quality and topic coverage. In some cases, however, changes may result from the need to shorten questionnaire, shorten interview time and meet budgetary constraints for operational activities.

If we analyze the core of Labor Force Surveys in Brazil and Colombia, for instance, we will find out that they are not much different from the average household survey - labor force-type - in Latin American countries. In all the countries analyzed in this report, the basic structure is the same: demographic characteristics of household members, characteristics of the dwelling, characteristics of the Labor Force. Of all

[24] Because the LSMS coverage of topics is rather extensive and intensive, the countries where the LSMS was done at least once, would appear on the table as having a good system in what refers to topics coverage; in most cases, however, the LSMS implementation in such countries has faced problems and either the LSMS was implemented only once or, even when several rounds were done, the survey was never really effectively institutionalized.

[25] By the same token, the table at this point does not contain information on the coverage of CASEN-type surveys. On the one hand, only Chile and Colombia seem to have this experience institutionalized. On the other, the major purpose of CASEN-type surveys is not to provide general social, economic and demographic indicators for socio-economic assessments but, rather, to serve as an instrument to measure the redistributive impact of social expenditures and to evaluate social programs, providing information for the close monitoring and targeting adjustments of social programs.

the topics that should ideally compose a balanced average household survey, however, Education and Migration are the only ones investigated on a more systematic basis in most countries in the main body of surveys.

In general terms, household surveys in Latin American countries cover the traditional aspects included in Labor Force Surveys. Seldom are they as extensive in coverage as, for instance, the Living Standards Measurement Survey. Health, Nutrition and Consumption are investigated in very few countries, usually countries with at least some LSMS experience. Most of the countries usually include some coverage of aspects like housing, sanitation and education. Even when they do, however, the coverage is not as extensive and detailed as it would be desirable, as the remainder of this section shows.

Labor Force-type surveys in Latin American countries (i) often lack the desired geographic coverage to be representative of both rural and urban areas; (ii) often lack the desired minimal coverage of topics to make them effective instruments in the assessment of overall living conditions in countries; (iii) often lack the desired in-depth coverage within topics to make them useful in the measurement of each of the dimensions to be included in the analysis of living standards. Although Income-Expenditures Surveys were not analyzed in this section, Table 1 shows that, in most countries, their frequency is very irregular.

If we look at surveys strictly from the point of view of topics coverage, countries which implemented LSMS-type surveys present a wider coverage of topics in the surveys they implement, even in the cases where the LSMS questionnaire was not fully implemented. This is the case in Bolivia, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Peru, Venezuela. In these countries, with the exception of Jamaica, problems may arise from different factors like geographic coverage, representativeness of data and frequency of implementation.

On the other hand, countries with a solid tradition in the implementation of Labor Force Surveys, like Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, for instance, seem to be the ones where topics coverage is the least extensive and where household surveys emphasize almost exclusively measurements of the labor force and the labor market. In these countries, however, institutional capacity and built-in knowledge and experience with household survey operations may provide a solid basis upon which to expand the topics coverage of household surveys.

Institutional capacity seems to be weaker in the smaller countries like Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname and Trinidad & Tobago. As previously mentioned, some of these countries may have implemented LSMS-type surveys but at an irregular frequency and circumscribed geographic coverage. At first glance, Paraguay may be at a slight advantage as compared to the other countries due to the implementation of the **Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica de las Familias Paraguayas**. However, in this case, as in any others in which surveys were conducted outside Statistical Offices, the countries do not benefit from the extremely relevant contribution survey implementation can bring to institution-building. The institutionalization of the Paraguay SES might greatly contribute to an improvement in the country's capacity in the area of household surveys, if the responsibility for its implementation is transferred to the Statistical Office and the lessons learned from its initial implementation can be absorbed.

The implementation of surveys on socio-economic characteristics of the households/families represents a major improvement in the system of social statistics in countries like Chile and Colombia. Like the Paraguay SES, the Chile and Colombia CASEN are narrower in scope than the LSMS. CASEN-type surveys are oriented towards the monitoring of target groups in social programs than towards the measurement of living conditions. However, they provide essential information on households and families which goes beyond labor market and the work force-related aspects and allows for the monitoring of social programs in these countries.

Most surveys are often not comparable over time or across countries. Particularly in what refers to comparability of indicators between countries, coverage of topics and within topics varies widely. A detailed list of aspects to be included in household surveys, particularly when they are expected to measure living standards, will be provided in the final section of this report. General recommendations for all countries here analyzed, however, include:

(i) because Population Census provide the basic information for sample frame and sample design in household surveys, these should be the first priority in countries. Countries in which Population Censuses have been done regularly, should proceed to improve their operational and data processing aspects to make them effective instruments in the planning of their regular program of household surveys. Improvements should include socio-economic characteristics on which an effective socio-economic stratification of the sample could be designed. The design of the census operation itself should include the concern with making the information obtained useful in the more effective design of samples for household surveys. [26]

(ii) as a second step, intra-country comparison across regions and over time should be prioritized over inter-countries comparison. Surveys should be representative at the national level, for rural and urban areas, for regions, states or provinces, capitals and metropolitan areas. In addition, depending on specific needs of information, particularly concerning information for policy-making and evaluation purposes, sub-segments like cities within one or several population ranges should also be represented in the sample.

(iii) a basic level of geographic coverage and representativeness (national, urban/rural, states and/or provinces, metropolitan areas and/or cities with population over a certain level) should be agreed upon. Agreement should also be fostered on the minimum frequency and the reference periods surveys will cover, as well as on the minimum number of topics and aspects within topics to be covered when inter-countries comparison is at stake. By defining a minimum number of indicators to be covered nationwide and the variables to cover them, and agreeing upon a common set of concepts to define these variables, countries would be able to provide information for inter-countries comparison while, at the same time, maintaining surveys as effective instruments to measure specific aspects which may differ from country to country.

(iv) Both intra-country and inter-countries comparisons might benefit from a schedule of coverage of topics in which certain topics could be covered annually, while others every two years. Demographic (including Migration, Fertility and Infant Mortality), Housing, Education, Labor and Income, and Health aspects should be investigated every year. Variable for Education and Health for the population as a whole should include coverage of access to services and expenditures. In addition, a summary schedule of expenditures and consumption (with type, quantity and amount per item) for food, housing and transportation to/from school/work. Food consumption should include meals at home and outside. Reference periods for food should be the week and, for transportation, either the week or the previous 15 days. Unless household surveys are used for the assessment of targeted programs for women and children, coverage of aspects like nutrition and access to pre-natal care could be done every two years.

(v) in the case of countries which choose to implement LSMS-type surveys, the implementation of modules should also be assessed on the basis of the needs for information. In addition, assessment could be made of the feasibility of using data from the LSMS to substitute for Income-Expenditures Surveys, particularly in the cases in which the LSMS is being implemented on a regularly basis. This recommendation, albeit controversial, results from the difficulties countries have in implementing IES.

(vi) in the case of countries which expect to use household survey data to measure the impact of government programs, assessment should be made of the feasibility of designing a questionnaire which combines social and demographic variables with more specific variables to measure program impact.

[26] cf. CEPAL, 1983: 37

(vii) household survey data cannot replace administrative data. Combined, they can provide effective information for the monitoring of socio-economic conditions and living standards. In some cases (infant mortality, access to education, access to health care, for instance) they can provide effective checks to administrative records and a good measure of how effectively public services are being delivered, of what groups are not receiving them and the reasons why.
Discussion on the implementation of social statistics should, therefore, consider the present needs for improvement in systems of administrative data and how this improvement can be effectively accomplished.

(viii) technical support to countries interested in improving their systems of household surveys should strongly emphasize the provision of support in institutional strengthening. Sustainability of changes, in the long run, will be highly dependent on each country's capacity to continue the program after technical support ends. To ensure continuity, countries projects presented to the ISLC Program initiative should schedule program implementation in two stages. The first, active stage, would include the technical support during the redesign of the survey, from the definition of what the program of surveys will consist of to the definition of operational, data processing and dissemination of information aspects. Continuity of the program could be ensured with the incorporation of a second stage in which technical visits to the country would be scheduled at regular intervals so as to provide technical support and an open line of communication, particularly concerning needs for technological updates and for updating in data processing instruments. A pattern for such on-going technical cooperation has proved very successful in the case of National Accounts in Latin American countries like Brazil and Argentina, with the INSEE - the French Central Statistical Office - providing technical support for countries to guarantee the standards of quality required of such sensitive indicators.

Chapter 4.

HEALTH, EDUCATION AND OTHER TOPICS COVERAGE IN FIVE COUNTRIES: ARGENTINA, BOLIVIA, CHILE, URUGUAY AND PARAGUAY

. The present section will provide an assessment of the indicators that can be obtained from surveys in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay. It will do so by comparing the 1989 Argentina and the 1989 and 1992-93 Uruguay surveys [27] - which are typically Labor Force-type surveys - with the Bolivia program of Integrated Household Surveys (EIH) - which is based on the LSMS-type survey - and with the CASEN (Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica in Chile and the Household Survey on the Socioeconomic Characteristics of Paraguayan Families (Encuesta sobre Características Socioeconómicas de las Familias Paraguayas), which, in this section, will be shortened to Paraguay SES (Paraguay Socioeconomic Survey) [28]. Although the Paraguay SES was a one-shot survey, contrary to the CASEN, which is institutionalized, its questionnaire content makes it a survey worthy of analysis.

The analysis emphasizes coverage of variables for the construction of Education and Health Indicators and is illustrative of the criteria used for the selection of countries to initiate the ISLC Program. The discussion of variables concerning the construction of Education and Health Indicators takes into account the framework set for organizing such indicators into Input, Access, Output and Outcome Indicators to be found in Vos (1992)

As mentioned in the previous chapter of this report, household surveys are a very effective source of data for the construction of social indicators, particularly of access, output and outcome indicators. The section below describes what kinds of input, access, output and outcome indicators can be obtained from household surveys in the 5 countries used for case-studies. Special attention will be given to Education and Health indicators, although this section also summarizes indicators that can be obtained on Housing, Sanitation, Population, Labor Force and Income, Nutrition and Expenditures and Consumption.

4.1. Housing and Population Characteristics

The Argentina survey and both Uruguay surveys collect information on the characteristics of dwellings, size and composition of household and marital status of respondents. In addition, the Argentina survey collects information on births and deaths plus inclusions or exclusions of people in the household. The use which is presently made of this information, however, is not clear since these variables are not included in the dictionary of variables and, therefore, are not coded. From a demographic point of view, however, this information is very useful for estimates (and cross-checking) of birth and death rates (although ages for the deceased are not provided) and to support the analysis of nuptiality patterns.

Both the 1989 Argentina and Uruguay surveys provide information on the type of dwelling, on whether the dwelling has running water, electricity and bathroom and on whether use of bathroom is exclusive of household unit; on the legal/property status of the dwelling and on the type of material predominantly used in external walls.

[27] The most recent version of the questionnaire for the Uruguay survey (1992-93) was obtained only when this paper was being concluded. so the analysis of the Uruguay survey will at first compare the 1989 Uruguay survey with the Argentinean survey and then add some analysis of the 1992-93 questionnaire, comparing it with the 1989 and trying to identify any improvements made.

[28] Sauma (1993), Sauma et. al (1993) and Monges et. al. (1993).

The Argentina survey does not collect information on the size of the dwelling (in number of rooms) nor number of rooms used as bedrooms. Such information could provide an important measure of population density (hacinamiento) in addition to the one that can be obtained from the existing questionnaires (average number of household members per household): average number of household members per room and per bedroom. Contrary to the Uruguay survey, there is no information on kitchen facilities neither on type of heat source used for cooking in the Argentina survey.

Information on sanitation services in the Argentina survey does not include water supply and sewerage neither on garbage collection and disposition, which would provide for indicators of sanitation conditions inside the dwelling and in its surroundings, an important measure to assess living conditions. Information on property value (in cases where the head of the household owns the dwelling) or on monthly rent is not provided, neither is the availability of basic appliances like cooking stoves and refrigerators.

Both surveys provide basic demographic information on household members (age, gender, marital status, etc.) and information on the relationship of respondents to the head of household as well as a control check for the respondent who provided the information (the surveyed member or another respondent).

The 1992-93 Uruguay survey, on the other hand, does not collect information on the material used to build the dwelling but instead asks about the overall quality of the building (comfortable, average, modest, precarious) and the building's overall conditions (needs major repairs done, needs minor repairs, does not need any repairs). It also asks about how many households share the dwelling and the number of people who live there as well as how many of them are over fourteen years of age.

The assessment of the overall quality conditions of the dwelling is left to the interviewer's discretion and the interviewer can request the support of the respondent in applying a list of criteria, described in the interviewer's manual, defining each category, including a description of the types of materials that characterize each of the quality categories as well as what is meant by major, minor and no repairs.

There are advantages in complementing this quality assessment for the traditional questions on material used in floor, walls and roof. The traditional questions on material used in floor, walls and roof allowed for the differentiation between buildings that had been actually erected and improvised constructions using, for instance, cardboard, tin, etc.

The information available prior to 1992 allowed for some differentiation concerning quality of material but not concerning the conditions of a dwelling in need of repair. It did not capture differences in the quality (and costs) of tiles or the wood used for floors, for instance. Therefore, it did not capture important differences in levels of household comfort, well-being (and even sumptuousness), in two houses both built with bricks, cement, shingles, and wooden floor, or two houses one of which has central air conditioning and heating and another which, although very comfortable, does not. Such differentiations are extremely relevant for refinements in the analysis of differentials in living conditions of sub-groups of a country's population.

Improvements in the 1992-93 Uruguay survey are complemented by a more detailed investigation of the sanitary conditions in the dwelling, with the inclusion of information on how the access to water by the household is done (whether there is running water in the dwelling or outside at a distance of more than 100 meters or less than 100 meters), and bathroom availability and sewage conditions, as well as on the availability of a series of equipments: heater, refrigerator with freezer, refrigerator, b/w t.v., color t.v., vcr, washer, dishwasher, microwave oven, car for exclusive use of household.

The 1989 Uruguay survey included one question on health coverage in the part of the questionnaire that covered characteristics of household members (this will be analyzed in section 4.4., on health coverage of surveys). The 1992-93 survey, in addition to widening the categories which cover this particular question on how respondent receives health care, includes an additional question on whether respondent was sick in the

previous 12 months. The previous format (from the 1989 survey) basically investigated the type of health care received by respondents [29]. The 1992 surveys goes one step ahead in linking the delivery of medical services to an actual episode of illness or sickness, thus providing some information for the construction of morbidity indicators.

Comparison of these surveys with the Bolivia EIH, the Paraguay Socioeconomic Survey (SES) and the Chile CASEN shows how much more extensive are these surveys in terms of topics and variables coverage. For instance, these surveys inquire about the type of material used in the walls, floor and roof or dwellings and, this way, can provide a better picture of overall conditions of dwelling than surveys which only ask about material in one or two components at most. In addition, both CASEN and the Paraguay SES also investigate the quality of each of these components, by adding a question on the conditions in which components were found: good condition, regular condition, bad condition. In doing so, these surveys allow for cross-tabulations of these variables concerning the general conditions of sanitation and, as the analysis of CASEN data puts it, the level of comfort in the household.

One particular concern in the area of Housing indicators is to measure output indicators like the housing deficit. This indicator provides an effective measure of the mismatch between the size of the population and the availability of housing and can be obtained particularly through the CASEN and the SES. The CASEN identifies families living together in a household (families defined as a couple, or a couple and their single children under 18 economically dependent of the parents, a single parent and his (her) children) as well as aggregates who are family members. The SES identifies households sharing a same dwelling.

These situations indicate the need for solutions which can either be at the housing policy level or at the level of poverty reduction itself. Families sharing one dwelling may indicate either a quantitative housing deficit, that is, more people than the dwellings available or a qualitative housing deficit, in which overcrowded dwellings are a result of families strategies for stretching limited budgets because affordable housing is not available. This situation is not captured in most regular labor force-type surveys, with the exception of the Guatemala survey which inquires how many families live in the household and the Brazilian PNAD which also identifies and classifies families sharing the same household.

The Bolivia EIH, Chile CASEN and Paraguay SES allow for the effective construction of indicators of access to basic public sanitation services: water, sanitation, electricity. In this sense, the Uruguay survey is more complete than the Argentinean in that it provides information on source of water, identifying whether it comes from public works or not and of connection of dwelling with the sewage system. Only the CASEN, however, covers variables especially designed to measure the effects and beneficiaries of specific housing policies.

There are no substantive differences among these surveys in the coverage of strictly demographic variables, except that the Argentina survey and CASEN do not cover Migration variables, while Bolivia, Uruguay and the Paraguay SES do. Surveys cover age and gender of respondents, as well as relationship to the head of household. Data from the Bolivia EIH allow for the identification of migration patterns, both urban-urban and rural urban, for the previous 5 years and in the previous year. The Paraguay data does not specify time frames for the analysis of migration patterns and the analysis of data from the survey does not include a section on Migration. [30]

[29] It also investigated whether respondents had any type of physical or mental disability.

[30] Fertility and Mortality indicators, although extremely relevant for demographic analysis are discussed under Health Indicators. Except for the Population Censuses and for special Health Surveys, Fertility and Mortality are only investigated in regular household surveys which apply modules on Health.

4.2. Labor Force, Occupation and Income

In the 1989 Argentina Survey, Housing and Demographic Characteristics comprise a set of 21 questions, in the Uruguay, 25. Occupation comprises forty-seven questions in Argentina and 50 in the Uruguay survey. In the Argentina survey, Income is investigated through one only question, in the Uruguay survey through 13 questions to workers or employees and 15 to respondents in agricultural activities. The 1992-93 Uruguay survey includes 32 questions on Housing, Demographic and Educational Characteristics of Household Members and 42 questions on Economic Activity, Occupations and the Labor Force and 17 questions on Income, of which 3 questions are on transfers and expenditures.

Occupation and the Labor Force

Investigation of Occupations and the Labor Force in household surveys usually follows the international conventions and definitions set by the ILO. In this sense, they try to identify the economically active population, the occupied and non-occupied as well as underemployment. Age of respondents varies slightly, ranging from 10 years and older in certain countries to 14 years and older in others. Definition of what constitutes "work" also varies slightly but usually includes performing certain tasks for a minimum number of hours (usually around 15 hours a week) and for some sort of pay, in cash or in kind. Depending on the characteristics of a country's economic activities, "work" may also include performing non-paid tasks at a family business.

More recently, in the last ten to fifteen years, much effort has been put into enlarging such definitions which are grounded on the characteristics of formal labor markets in structured economies of developed countries. Such efforts include enlarging the definition of "work" to include activities which are characteristic of informal labor markets, like home production and the performing of paid tasks for at least one hour a week; they also include enlarging the scope of respondents, inquiring respondents younger than 10 about the performance of any activities which directly or indirectly generate income for the household.

Coverage of Occupations and the Labor Force in the 1989 Uruguay survey includes respondents 14 and older; in the Chile CASEN and the Paraguay SES, respondents 12 and older. In Bolivia and Argentina respondents are 10 and older. Surveys differ in their approach for identifying the economically active population, the occupied and not-occupied, as well as underemployment.

The 1989 Uruguay and Argentina surveys, for instance, define as occupied those who worked for some pay or, in the case of Argentina, with no pay for more than 15 hours a week while the Bolivia and the CASEN enlarge this approach and ask respondents who say they did not work during the week whether they had not worked even one hour, even helping a relative, even as an apprentice, even selling something. Any of those situations would characterize respondents as occupied. The Paraguay survey is the only one that begins the module on Occupations and the Labor Force inquiring about the respondent's principal activity in the previous six months.

While the Bolivia and the CASEN approach allows for a better characterization of the occupied population, the CASEN does not allow for the characterization of underemployment. The Uruguay and Bolivia surveys and the Paraguay SES in addition to the questions used to characterize unemployment and which are related to the respondents search for a job, also inquire of those who are working whether they would like to work more hours a week. This way, they allow for the estimation of under-utilization of the labor force. The Uruguay survey goes further, inquiring whether respondent would like to have another job, and also asks about what the respondent did to find another job as well as the reasons why the respondent is looking for another job.

Even in what refers to the characterization of unemployment, The Argentina survey only investigates the search for a job for the non-occupied who are not on unemployment compensation, which restricts even more the potential for data from this survey to analyze the characteristics of unemployment in general and the match (or mismatch) between the labor market and the labor force.

Of all surveys, only CASEN and the Bolivia survey try to capture certain characteristics of the informal labor market. CASEN asks whether respondents have a signed contract concerning the present occupation and inquires about the site the location where the occupational activity is performed, with both "at home" and "in the street" as alternatives. The Bolivia survey investigates self-employed or "on own account" concerning the work-site. Alternatives, in addition to a fixed location, include "in a mobile unit" and "as a street vendor".

The Paraguay SES investigates the informal market through an investigation of the inactive population, asking whether those classified as students, housewives, retired and handicapped had performed any activity in the last 6 months like washing, ironing, cooking, sewing, washing cars, technical, professional or arts and crafts and how much they were paid for these activities.

The Uruguay and Bolivia surveys also investigate the inactive population in more detail, the Bolivia survey by asking them whether they would like to work and why they do not, and the Uruguay survey by asking them whether in the last twelve months they took any professional or technical capacitation courses, what type, where the course was taught and why the respondent took it.

Income

Coverage of income variables can express the different objectives in the design of different surveys. The SES in Paraguay was designed with the major goal of analyzing socio-economic characteristics of the population within the wider framework of differentials in income distribution. The survey was designed to capture income from : (i) salaries and wages, in cash and in kind, for respondents who were workers and employees, from all sources including commissions, reimbursements for business expenses, prizes, Christmas bonuses,etc.; (ii) profits, the gross entrepreneurial income of own account or employers, considering both cash an in-kind income; (iii) interest income; (iv) dividends, including dividends received for the property of firms; (v) rental income; (vi) imputed rental income for families who own the dwelling where they live or live in dwelling borrowed, income was imputed from how much rent they would pay were they renting that dwelling; (vii) other types of property income like rental of machinery, transportation equipment, etc.; (viii) retirement income and pensions for accident or illness; (ix) family transfers of income, in cash or in kind, including child support; (x) other institutional transfers, in cash or in kind, excluding pensions.

Grouping income from these sources into three categories - primary income, property income, and transfers (including both pensions and retirement income and family and institutional transfers) - the Paraguay SES allows for the analysis of family income at the national and regional level, for the identification of regional differences in the distribution of income, for comparisons of results from this study with results from previous studies and for comparisons at the international level with other Latin American countries.

In addition, it contains an agricultural and livestock activities and production supplement which investigates agriculture and livestock production. This supplement allows for a thorough investigation of rural activities, collecting information on their relative importance in the distribution of rural economic activities, on production, crops, animals raised and prices, on land property and land distribution. It does not however, cover self-employed in rural activities, only salaried workers, and family members.

Together with information provided in the main questionnaire, such data allow for the analysis of: volume production, quantity and surface of farms and quantity and surface of farms according to land property

rules, land usage and types of crops, technological resources available and their use, relationship between production for household consumption and production for sale, etc. It also allows for a thorough analysis of agricultural employment, types of labor relations in the agricultural activity, the occupational structure of the population occupied in agricultural activities, their educational level, position in the occupation, etc.

It allows for an analysis of population occupied in the traditional and modern segments of the agricultural labor market, as well as of underemployment and, of course, of income from agricultural and livestock activities. Finally, it allows for comparisons along the dimensions related to the characteristics of economic activities, labor market, income, education, between those in urban and those in agricultural-livestock occupations.

The 1989 Uruguay survey is rather detailed in what refers to income coverage, and overall includes the same categories and definitions as the ones used in the Paraguay SES, covering income from agricultural activities separately as well as imputed rent income for families who own the dwelling or use somebody else's dwelling for free. The Uruguay survey, however, does not investigate the farming unit as a production unit and does not differentiate tips from bonuses, compensation, commissions and overtime pay (they are all lumped together in one category). The geographic coverage of the Uruguay survey, however, is only urban and can only be desagregated for Montevideo and the remaining urban area of the country.

The only question on income in the Argentina survey asked about the amount and source of income in the previous month (no income, income from labor, income from self-employment, pensions and benefits, rent, property, interest and dividends income, income from retirement or pension, other types of income) and does not differentiate between income from main and secondary occupation in those cases where respondents had more than one occupation. It does not differentiate rent income from interest and dividend income. Neither Argentina nor Bolivia cover imputed rent income.

A Brief Assessment of the 1992-93 Uruguay LFS in what refers to Occupation and Income Variables

The 1992-93 survey introduces some changes in the variables used to investigate Labor and the Labor Force, although it keeps the age parameters for respondents as fourteen years and older. The most important changes in this survey as compared to the 1989 one were make in the investigation of income.

Innovation in the section investigating the characteristics of the labor force consist of asking respondents whether in the previous six months they did any work activity in a locality other than where they reside, either in Uruguay or abroad, whether this was their principal or their secondary activity and what activity it was and how often respondents traveled to this locality. It drops questions on capacitation courses and adds a question on how long the respondent has been in the present occupation.

The section on Income includes 3 questions on transfers/expenditures: (a) how much respondent paid/spent in the previous month giving financial help to relatives, paying alimony or child support or contributing to other households; (b) how much the head of household paid for rent of dwelling (in the case of tenants); (c) how much the head of the household paid of mortgage in the previous month (in the case of heads of household who are owners and are paying for the dwelling).

In the 1992-93 survey, "tips" became one separate category in the investigation of the composition of income both of employees or workers in the public sector and employees and workers in the private sector, while, in the 1989 survey "tips" were included with commissions and overtime compensation. In addition, it collects separate information for employees and workers in the private sector and employees and workers in the public sector as two occupational categories (while in the 1989 these groups were investigated together).

The investigation of income for own account respondents and for members of cooperatives of production was also widened in the 1992-93 survey, including 3 different sources of income: cash, family contributions and social benefits, and income in kind. The investigation of income for employers includes cash income and income in kind as in the 1989 survey.

Finally, for all occupational groups, the 1992-93 survey asks of respondents how much they received in the previous 12 months, from the country or from abroad, in retirement pensions or other types of pensions, in grants, scholarships and other subsidies, in family contributions, compensations for divorce or separation, contributions from other households, rent and leasing, interest, dividends and other types of income. Members of cooperatives of production are also asked how much they received in shares of profits, in the previous 12 months, in cash and in kind.

4.3. Education

A. Educational Indicators

The Argentinean HHS covers Education with 4 questions at the end of the questionnaire. These questions are applied to and coded for residents five years and older:
- can (respondent) read and write
- does (respondent) attend or has attended school
- what type of school facility (Pre-School - n/a, Elementary, National, Commercial, Teachers' Training [Normal], Technical, Other type of Secondary Level School, High School, College)
- whether level was completed or not.

From these questions, only some attainment/output indicators can be obtained: literacy rates, school attendance (excluding pre-school), highest level studied and whether it was completed or not or level attending. There is no information on grade. According to De Jong's analysis of the 1980, 1986 and 1989 Argentina surveys, the 1980 and 1986 collected information on pre-school attendance and the 1980 survey also collected information on last grade completed in addition to highest level studied (De Jong, 1995).

The 1989 Uruguay survey covers pre-school attendance, including whether pre-school is paid or not and school attendance with last grade and level completed of regular schooling. The 1992-93 Uruguay survey, however, shows some improvements in this section, asking of all respondents whether they attend an educational institution and type, for those who do not attend whether they have ever attended, whether institution attended is public, private and the student pays for it or private and the student does not pay for it. It also asks for the highest level and grade approved and whether the level was completed. Finally, it introduces a question for respondents 6 years and older on whether they attend language courses, computer courses, typing or shorthand or other types of courses.

The Bolivia EIH, Paraguay SES and Chile CASEN cover Education in more detail. The three surveys cover attendance and reasons for not attending school as well as last grade and level completed. The Paraguay survey, however, does not include "distance" as one possible reason for non-attendance.

Neither the Bolivia survey or the Paraguay survey investigate the present grade and level of respondents, although the Bolivia survey inquires about whether respondents have failed once or several times in elementary (basic) school.

The Paraguay survey does not investigate literacy directly, with the question on whether respondent can read and write and the Bolivia survey does not investigate whether school is paid or not. The CASEN does not directly investigate whether school is paid or not, but it includes, nevertheless, whether vouchers are provided, with what frequency and asks for the name and address of the school. The CASEN is also the only

survey inquiring about whether and what types of school meal children attending pre-school and elementary school receive. This stresses the use of CASEN data for the monitoring of programs and their beneficiaries rather than for the more encompassing socio-economic characterization of the population.

Only the Bolivia survey covers expenditures on Education, in its module on household expenditures. Coverage basically refers to how much was spent in the previous month with the payment of school, the payment of extra-curricular courses (English, typing, computers, etc.) and how much was spent in the previous year with school or university registration fees. Expenditures are provided as a lump sum, with no indication, in the case of expenditures with several children, of separate expenditures per child.

Coverage of educational variables in the Argentina survey is very poor, particularly in what refers to the construction of access and outcome indicators, but also in what refers to the construction of output indicators. The Uruguay survey provides a slightly better coverage particularly in what refers to attempts to obtain information for the construction of access indicators. CASEN's stress on providing information for the construction of indicators allowing for the monitoring of social programs places much emphasis on information for the construction of access indicators as well as, to a certain extent, to input indicators. The Paraguay SES as well as the Bolivia household survey also seem to place greater emphasis on access indicators than output and outcome indicators.

The gaps and deficiencies stressed above show that at least some improvement is required in all surveys so that they can provide an effective coverage of educational variables. It must be noted, however, the peculiar position of the CASEN as compared with the other surveys because the CASEN was not conceived as an instrument to analyze living conditions or to provide information for the construction of social indicators but, rather, as a means of monitoring specific social policies under implementation in Chile.

From this point of view, what this paper stresses is that, in addition to the CASEN, Chile could also benefit from the implementation of a survey instrument much broader in scope in order to measure living conditions. In all other cases, improvements are required in order to more effectively cover educational indicators.

B. Overall Assessment of Coverage of Educational Indicators

Coverage of Education is not as complete as desirable for the measurement of living conditions in all countries analyzed. In the case of traditional Labor Force-type Surveys, coverage of Education is restricted to a few variables which are considered as relevant for analyses of the characteristics of the labor force. In the case of the Uruguay survey, a few elements are provided to slightly expand the analysis of the educational characteristics of the population, particularly in what refers to schooling. Even the Bolivia EIH, the most thorough of the five surveys analyzed, does not provide all the elements which are required for the construction of educational indicators. Coverage of Education in the Bolivia survey contrasts, in a sense, with the coverage of Health in the same survey, which is much more thorough, as the next section will show.

4.4. Health and Nutrition

The Argentina survey does not cover health and the Uruguay survey only asks how respondents receive medical care and whether they have any type of physical, mental or emotional difficulty that prevents them from performing normal daily activities, either professional or educational.

Again the Bolivia EIH, the Paraguay SES and the Chile CASEN are the surveys in which coverage of Health is more complete. The Paraguay survey does not cover nutrition, while the Bolivia EIH and the CASEN assess nutritional conditions of children based on anthropometric measures and, in the case of Bolivia of information on food consumption by the household. Among these three surveys, the Bolivia EIH provides the most complete coverage of Health, allowing for the construction of the following health indicators:

A - Output Indicators

- Mortality Rates - Infant mortality rates and mortality rates for children younger than one and younger than five.

- Morbidity Rates for Children - rates for the most prevalent illnesses according to type of illness.

- Birth Rates

- Fertility Rates

- Life Expectancy at Birth

- Anthropometric measures: Weight/Age for children younger than 5 and Height/Age for Children 6-7 years old

B - Input Indicators

- Population with access to services per type of service

- Immunization coverage

- Average food consumption per household member

C - Access Indicators

- Number of medical visits per adult, per episode of illness or disease.

- Limitations to access medical services (including income limitations and limitations resulting from the physical distance to the nearest health service facility)

D - Other Indicators

In addition to the indicators that directly measure health and nutritional conditions of the population, a set of related input indicators in the areas of education and housing are important in that they contribute to

differentiate and explain relative differences among sub-groups of the population in access and output indicators. These related input indicators are:

- the educational level of the mother and of the head of the household: studies have repeatedly demonstrated that there is a strong positive correlation between education and health. Better educated people are usually more informed about proper nutrition and hygiene habits, better-educated mothers tend to seek pre-natal care, tend to breastfeed babies more often and for longer periods (an important element in the transmission of antibodies for several diseases) and better educated people will more often than not be able to identify symptoms and conditions requiring medical attention, to seek the right kind of medical attention for those conditions, and to follow medical instructions correctly.

- The same is true for income. In part the relationship between income and health conditions is covered through indicators of limitations to access medical services facilities). In addition to those, however, income (both average income per household and average per capita income) is an efficient predictor of possibilities to access medical care. The higher the income of a household, the better are the chances that its members will be able to afford not only medical care but also good nutrition habits. Higher income households will, more often than not, be able to afford proper housing, particularly in what refers to sanitation and will more often than not, be able to afford private medical insurance, and medicines when prescribed. Income is also an important indicator to be used in the targeting of health programs.

- Sanitation conditions of the household, the general conditions of the material used in the construction of the dwelling and household density are important in the assessment of health conditions. Studies have repeatedly shown that improvements in sanitation conditions, particularly in what refers to access to clean water, availability of bathroom and connection to sewage systems, may dramatically reduce infant and children mortality rates as well as the incidence of diseases, like cholera that thrive where poor sanitary conditions prevail.

Finally, the fourth round of the Bolivia EIH (1991) collects information on cholera. Data from the Bolivia EIH also allow for the identification of target population groups in governmental programs in general and in the area of health education, particularly and, thus, to match this information with information from administrative records concerning participants in and coverage of such programs.

The Paraguay SES does not cover health indicators for women and children in particular, neither does it cover input and output indicators as extensively as the Bolivia survey, restricting itself mostly to information on which to base the construction of access indicators. It covers morbidity for the whole population inquiring about whether respondents felt sick in the last year, what kind of medical care they used, where this care was provided and, in the case of those who did not seek medical care, why not. It also covers hospital stays in the previous year and length of stay, as well as coverage and type of health insurance (Social Security Institute or private or both), social security coverage and type and how much the contributions to social security are.

Data from the Paraguay SES allow for the construction of morbidity rates but not per most common types of diseases; population with access to services per type of service, and limitations to access medical services (with special emphasis on income limitations and limitations resulting from the physical distance to the nearest health service facility). Life expectancy rates can be derived from the survey as well as related input indicators: educational level of heads of household and of mothers wives of heads of household, income and sanitation conditions in the dwelling.

The Paraguay SES does not provide data to measure infant and children mortality rates or morbidity rates for most common types of diseases, fertility rates, pre-natal care, breastfeeding, immunization, anthropometric measures nor food consumption in the household. It does, however, provide indicators of access to food consumption, through an agricultural production-animal raising supplement which provides

information on crops and animals raised, products harvested and how much was used for household consumption, both human and animal, how much was given and how much was sold.

The Chile CASEN covers health more extensively than the Paraguay SES but from a different perspective, since its major interest is to assess coverage and types of beneficiaries of social programs in health. It includes specific questions on women and children for conditions covered by social programs, such as pregnancy and childhood. It does not, however, extensively cover information for the construction of output indicators, concentrating instead on access and input indicators.

A - Output Indicators

- Nutritional Conditions - children younger than 15 and pregnant women. The source of information can be either the medical follow-up booklet or the interviewer.

- morbidity - episode of illness or accident in the last three months

B - Input Indicators

- Availability of Services

- Immunization coverage

- PAP tests for women over 15

- Childbirth: C-sections, natural

- Preventive health care

- Cigarette smoking and frequency

- Pregnant Women, children younger than five and women who are breastfeeding - whether in the previous three months they received from the health office milk, milk and cereal, rice, and, if not, why not.

C - Access Indicators

- Number of medical visits per adult, per episode of illness or disease in the previous three months, per type of health facility and type of services received.

- Access to services like preventive health care, laboratory exams, medical visit to internist, to specialists, XRays or Echo-scanning, childbirth, hospitalization, surgery.

- Limitations to access medical services (including income limitations and limitations resulting from the physical distance to the nearest health service facility)

- dental assistance in the last 6 months, whether for emergency and whether treatment was provided

- whether vouchers were used or services were not paid

- medicines prescribed and whether they had to be paid for.

D - Other Indicators

Similarly to the Bolivia EIH and the Paraguay SES, the CASEN can also provide a set of related input indicators in the areas of education and housing that are useful to differentiate and explain relative differences among sub-groups of the population in access and output indicators. These related input indicators are: the educational level of the mother and of the head of the household, income, sanitation conditions of the dwelling.

E. Overall Assessment of Health Coverage

Investigation of Health, particularly of certain aspects like Fertility, Infant Mortality, Contraception and Morbidity is always subject to the perceptions of respondents on these issues. The classical sequence of questions to assess fertility and infant mortality rates is subject to the correct recollection on the part of women of the number of children they had, to cultural perceptions involving single women who became pregnant and do not want to expose this fact to interviewers and to cultural conventions on stillbirths and death of children at birth.

Similarly, morbidity information may be affected by cultural perceptions of sickness as well as by the knowledge respondents have of symptoms which require medical attention. In all those cases, the correct use of administrative records (hospital records, vital statistics, etc.) could greatly reduce eventual errors in the interpretation of household data.

There is no way to assess the quality of data obtained in the surveys analyzed in this paper. The analysis of the questionnaires, however, shows that in the cases of surveys investigating health variables, much attention was paid to input and access indicators, particularly the ones related to government provided health services like immunization, medical care, pap tests, preventive health care and costs of obtaining certain services, be those costs measured in currency or in terms of how easy (or difficult) the access to health facilities is for the population as a whole. In addition, surveys investigating health variables paid special attention to vulnerable groups of the population: infants, children, pregnant women and women in childbearing age.

4.5. Income and Expenditures: the Investigation of Household Budgets in Labor Force Type Surveys

As mentioned in the previous section, only the Bolivia EIH covers in a more systematic way, Household Expenditures, particularly expenditures with food. The Uruguay and Argentina LFS-type surveys do not cover household budgets, expenditures and food consumption at all. Neither do the CASEN or the Paraguay SES. In the case of Paraguay, only crops and animal products used by the household for the consumption of its members are covered.

Both the CASEN and the 1992-93 Uruguay Labor Force Survey investigate the household is investigated concerning the existence of certain durable goods which might indicate relative differences in levels of consumption and comfort of households. In the case of CASEN, these items are: radio/tape player, B/W TV, bicycle, color TV, Refrigerator, Washer, VCR and car. In the case of Uruguay, bicycles are not included, refrigerators are differentiated between refrigerators with freezer and without freezer and heater, dishwasher and microwave oven are added to the list. This investigation is not an investigation of consumption but the information it gathers can be used for an overall assessment of the relative comfort and well-being households at different levels of income, enjoy.

4.6. Indicators and Measures of Living Standards: a summary

Table 4 (ANNEX) provides an overview of the five country-case studies concerning data coverage for the construction of input, access, output and outcome indicators in Education, Health and Nutrition. This basic list of indicators contains only the ones which can be obtained from household survey data and does not include other indicators which may be obtained from administrative data.[31]

In general terms, the table shows that household surveys - when properly designed, implemented and analyzed - can be particularly useful in providing data for the construction of access and output indicators, particularly in sectors like Health, Education and Housing; they can be extremely useful in the identification of the most vulnerable groups in the population which should be targeted as beneficiaries of social programs. Finally, they can also be very useful for the general assessment of programs and policies, particularly of the outcome of longer term policies and their impact on overall living conditions of the population. Household surveys are also an effective instrument to assess access to services.

Household surveys can be useful instruments to complement information collected at Social Services Facilities and known as Points of Services Delivery Surveys, that is, surveys of beneficiaries of programs which are applied to users as they come to receive the service. While PSDS can only cover those who are actually receiving the service, household surveys can provide information on those who should be receiving the service but who are not and on the reasons why they are not. It must be noted, however, that the use of household survey data to assess individual, specific, social programs in detail and social programs which do not cover all areas of the country, may prove to be extremely difficult due to the nature of the phenomena these surveys are designed to measure and of the sample design required to measure them.

This is the case, for instance, with trying to use household survey data for the assessment of coverage of food subsidy programs for children and pregnant women, of for assessing programs designed to alleviate urban poverty, or rural poverty. Specific programs and projects will much benefit from the overall picture of potential beneficiary groups and how they differ from other socio-economic groups that only national-scale household survey operations can provide. Targeting and monitoring of such programs and projects, as well as impact assessment, however, should be based on instruments clearly designed for such purposes.

Rather than instruments to measure outputs of specific social programs, household surveys can be efficient instruments to monitor general living conditions and, as a result, to provide data for the monitoring of outcome indicators (externalities) which go beyond the specific purposes of a program and have an impact on such a broad range of areas as to affect the general well-being of a population and are usually well-captured by well-designed household surveys.

Table 4 shows that, of the five countries studied, Argentina and Uruguay are the ones in which surveys requiring, by far, the most improvements in their content and coverage of topics and variables. The content of questionnaires in the 1989 Argentina survey and the 1989 Uruguay surveys is clearly directed to capturing the characteristics of urban labor, urban employment and income and although improvements have been made in the 1992-93 Uruguay Labor Force Survey, they do no alter its nature and composition of topics under investigation.

In general terms, the Argentina survey is the less encompassing in topics coverage, immediately followed by the Uruguay survey. In fact, in spite of improvements in the questionnaire of the 1992 Uruguay survey, its structure is still basically the same structure of a traditional household survey.

[31] Table 1 provides information on the overall status of household surveys and Table 2 provides information on international support to survey-related activities in these countries, Table 3 provides an overview of topics coverage for each country.

The Bolivia EIH presents the most inclusive topics coverage from the point of view of the measurement of living standards, although the material analyzed provides no indication on data quality as well as on how effectively social indicators are processed for analysis. The Chile CASEN is the most well-rounded survey from the point of view of the objectives of the survey and the construction of its questionnaire. However, as previously mentioned, it does not exhaustively cover living conditions but rather concentrates on measures allowing for the monitoring of social programs and their beneficiaries.

Together with the Chile CASEN, the Paraguay SES presents a well-rounded coverage of basic variables to analyze the socio-economic characteristics of Paraguayan families, although not as extensive and integrated as the one provided in surveys based on the LSMS, with modular questionnaires, like the Bolivia survey. It must be noted, however, that the Paraguay SES is rather different from the CASEN in that it is not institutionalized yet. From the point of view of institutionalization and effective use of results, the CASEN experience is by far the most successful of all. The Paraguay SES was a one-time survey and has not been institutionalized. However, it may provide a good starting point for a program designed to improving the quality of household surveys in that country.

Chapter 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analysis of different experiences in the implementation of household survey programs point to the relevance of institutional and government support for the success of these programs. Multilateral agencies and development banks have repeatedly stressed the importance of a country's government support in the success of a program. In this sense, the Jamaica experience with the LSMS and the Chilean experience with the CASEN provide the best evidence, of successful, on-going household surveys activities. The Jamaica experience was not analyzed in detail in this paper for two reasons: (i) on the one hand, it is an exception in the attempt to integrate the LSMS with its regular program of household surveys; (ii) on the other, because it was already extensively analyzed by Grosh (1991).

An assessment of the Bolivian system of social statistics (Vos: 1992, part 3, p. 3-6) stresses that the need of macroeconomic policies for the control of inflation beginning in 1995 assigned priority to the regular production of economic indicators. As a result, social statistics for the production of social indicators present several problems, among them: discontinuity in time, high dispersion of information sources (including administrative records), non-existence of a central coordinating agency, lack of analytical classifications of topics for analysis (the only classifications available are the sectoral one), high degree of aggregation of data, areas in which very little has been done to create a system of statistics (like Nutrition and Housing). In addition, administrative records which form an important source of information for this system, are not always timely or effectively transferred to the INE (the central statistical agency).

Along similar lines, an assessment of Argentina's INDEC (Instituto Nacional de Estadisticas y Censos) was published in April 1994 under the Program of Consolidation of the Financial and Administrative Reform of the Public Sector. This Program, supported by the IDB, intends to improve the management efficiency of the Public Sector and includes, among its components, the modernization of the Argentinean National Statistical System [32]. According to this document, Social and Demographic Statistics at INDEC enjoy a better reputation among users than the Economic Statistics. However, concerning the Sociodemographic Statistics in general the document states that:

> "No obstante, la profundización del análisis revela carencias en varias áreas que tienen que ver con la cobertura geográfica, la modernización metodológica, el procesamiento incompleto de información y el retraso en la implementación de encuestas básicas para el país" (Melgar, 1994: 28)

And concerning the Household Surveys in particular, it says:

> "A pesar que las evaluaciones internas y externas concluyen favorablemente en cuanto a la calidad de la información que recaba, se reconoce que la EPH tiene muchas limitaciones y carencias: faltan las localidades más chicas, deberia ser representativa al menos del país urbano, el cuestionario está en vigencia desde hace 20 años, el marco muestral se basa en el Censo de 1980 y los muchos cambios experimentados por el mercado de trabajo no pueden ser totalmente captados" (Melgar, 1994: 31)

The document mentions efforts, in the form of isolated efforts to redesign the survey which may point in the direction of improvements. However, the revision as a whole lacks a schedule and does not count with enough human and material resources to implement it. The major advance so far had been the creation of a working group in charge of designing the sample frame - based on the 1991 Census - for all household surveys,

[32] cf. Alicia T. Melgar. 1994.

including the Income-Expenditures Survey, which however is far from concluding the proposed task for lack of human resources in Statistics, Sociology and Economics.

This document lists the activities which are required for improvement of overall quality and efficiency in this area. We can perfectly adapt these recommendations to apply, in their almost entirety, to all countries analyzed in this report, as follows:

a) regular Income-Expenditures Survey to update the CPI system of weights and to extend CPI calculations to a wider geographic basis as well as to estimate and analyze the consumption of families;

b) a system of municipal information;

c) good quality administrative data on educational establishments and regular censuses of educational establishments;

d) the regular updating of the sample frame for household surveys;

e) a sample design for Permanent Household Surveys which allows for estimates at the national, regional and and state level, urban and rural, and for municipalities and urban conglomerates above a certain population size;

f) compatibility in the classification of occupations used in the population census and in the economic surveys;

g) analysis of internal and external migrations;

h) effective dissemination of data from the Census, the Permanent Household Surveys and other sources;

5.1. General Recommendations

The analysis of household surveys in Latin American countries should take into account the countries are different in their weaknesses and strngths in this area. While some countries may need improvements in geographic coverage and others in topics coverage, others may need to put more effort in the timeliness with which information is released. What this paper really intends to show, however, is that a whole effort may be required, in all countries to reconceptualize household surveys so as to meet the present needs of analysis.which is focused on social, rather than economic development issues and outcomes.

In general terms, the overall quality and efficiency of social statistics for policy-making in Latin America requires:

(i) timely and reliable Income-Expenditures Surveys in addition to a regular program of household surveys with improved geographic and topics coverage;

(ii) a system of information which accounts for indicators at different levels, from the national, to the municipal, including urban and rural and one in which operational procedures could be decentralized so as to allow different administrative levels to collect and organize information relevant for their specific planning and policy-making needs;

(iii) the systematic updating of sample frames and improvements in the sample design of household surveys;

(iv) improvements in the classification of occupations and the use of standard concepts and definitions linking the information extracted from economic, demographic and social surveys;

(v) standard sets of tables and tabulations for the demographic census and regular household surveys so as to allow for inter-census comparative analysis;

Even in the countries where a relatively stable system of household surveys has been in operation, their content falls short of providing sound information for the much required analysis of living conditions. From this point of view, actions designed to improve the content, geographic coverage, methodology and operational procedures require attention to institutional difficulties in the area of data collection and production of statistical information in virtually all Latin American countries.

Looking more closely at the five cases analyzed in the previous section, for example, both the Argentina and the Uruguay Household Surveys need improvements both in geographic coverage and in topics coverage. Geographic coverage itself cannot be solved by merely incorporating rural strata to the sample. In fact, rural household surveys constitute, in themselves, a special type of survey in the sense that the categories and concepts used to investigate housing, economic activities and the labor market, income, education, etc. in urban areas are not adequate to investigate these topics in rural areas.

Quite often, the measurement of the characteristics of employment and of the labor force, as well as of housing and education will require a completely new questionnaire, designed to capture the peculiarities of these aspects in rural areas. The Bolivia EIH, which is LSMS-based and, more specifically the Paraguay SES are the surveys which allow for a better apprehension of rural aspects.

The Paraguay SES is organized in such a way as to effectively capture all the details of rural economic activities and their impact at the household level. The LSMS-model, in general, deals with the specific rural characteristics more comfortably due to the modular construction of its questionnaire: the module which is used for the investigation of economic activities in urban areas is different from the one used to investigate these activities in rural areas. Labor force surveys, however, are much less flexible. As a result, the few countries where the LFS sample covers both rural and urban areas, do not present particularly rich data

concerning the rural areas. Brazil is one known case that comes to mind in which attempts have been made at a certain point to conduct an LFS specifically designed for rural areas.

Recommendations for extending household survey coverage to rural areas should stress that such an extension implies an expansion of content and concepts with implications in the structure of the survey questionnaire itself through the incorporation of one questionnaire especially designed to be applied in rural areas and with content and concepts appropriate to capture different rural realities (mountain x plains, fertile soil x rocky areas, agriculture and/or livestock, etc.).

The Agriculture/Livestock supplement to the Paraguay Socio-Economic Survey is one step ahead in this direction in what refers to the analysis of agricultural activities and the characteristics of employment and the labor force in rural areas, as previously described. Because this supplement investigates not only agricultural and livestock production and income, but also the socio-economic characteristics of agricultural-livestock activities it may be used as an effective starting point for planning rural coverage of regular programs of household surveys.

The CASEN survey must be analyzed as a complement to a regular program of household surveys and -so it appears - a very efficient one for monitoring social investments. However, because it mostly covers indicators of access to the social programs being delivered, an instrument is required to measure topics the CASEN does not cover neither does Chile's PIDEH (Programa Integrado de Encuestas de Hogares. Coverage of these topics includes, particularly, variables for the construction of input indicators for health and education (nutrition), and output indicators in health (fertility rates, birth rates, mortality rates including infant and child mortality rates, life expectancy rates. Some of the sectoral output indicators are also general outcome indicators in the sense that improvements in their rates imply overall improvements in living conditions of the population.

5.2. Recommendations on Topics Coverage

Effective production of input, access, output and outcome indicators requires a more extensive coverage of topics coverage in household surveys in general than the one already available. Of the five surveys analyzed here, Bolivia, Chile and Paraguay provide a somewhat effective coverage of access indicators and the Bolivia EIH provides the most effective variables range coverage within each topic as well as the widest coverage of topics since it includes some information on Nutrition and on Expenditures. The Paraguay SES provides an effective coverage of topics concerning rural economic activities. On the other hand, the CASEN seems to be the best designed survey to investigate access and output indicators for special social programs.

Effective coverage of topics should also provide the basic elements for the organization of information under different classification systems in such a way that it could be analyzed from different approaches: either the sectoral, which was chosen to organize the information on surveys in this report, or for different population groups and different policy issues: children, women, mothers, the work force, the older population, poverty, etc. The general recommendations listed in section 3.6 of this report for all Latin American countries applies to some countries analyzed in this part.

Particularly in what refers to the need for improvements in geographic coverage aiming at representativeness of rural areas, frequency and level representativeness of data, the regular program of household surveys in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay require as much attention as any other Latin American country. As previously mentioned, however, geographic coverage, frequency and level of representativeness of data are not an issue in the Chilean CASEN and the Paraguayan SES. Topics coverage in Bolivia's EIH is rather encompassing as compared to the average of surveys analyzed while the Argentina and Uruguay surveys require improvements in all areas.

Improvements in each of these areas should take into account the need to guarantee data comparability within each country across time as well as, if possible, a minimum level of comparability across countries. Comparability of data within each country can only be guaranteed through comprehensive geographic coverage with data disaggregation for different geographic and administrative levels (national, rural, urban, states and municipalities, metropolitan regions, cities within strata of population). Comparability of data across countries can only be achieved through a core of topics and variables within topics which will be covered with the same methodology and operational procedures across countries, regardless of variables introduced to cover phenomena which are peculiar to individual countries.

A list of variables to be covered within each topic to provide a basic set of input, access, output and outcome social indicators as well as coverage for specific population groups and policy issues is provided below:

Topic	Type of Indicator	Indicators	Variables
3 AND DEMOGRAPHIC TERISTICS (1)		* Density	square footage - number of rooms and number of rooms used as bedrooms
		* Sanitation	access to drinking water (type and source), - bathroom and connection to sewerage - garbage collection and disposition - kitchen facilities and cooking conditions (type of fuel)
			- availability of stove, refrigerator, radio, t.v. set.
		* Level of comfort available to household members	
		* Demographic Characteristics	-age -gender -relationship to head of household
		* Migration	- place of birth (urban or rural area) - when and why respondent left place of birth - how long in present location - localities where respondent lived between place of birth and present location
ION (2)	* Input	- Father's and Mother's last grade/level completed	- last grade and level completed for all members of household
		- Housing, Health and Nutrition Indicators	- listed in Housing, Health/Nutrition Section
	* Access	- Type of School - Costs - Geographic Access	- Public, Private, whether paid or not - how much in tuition, fees, uniforms - how long does it take, kinds of transportation used
	* Output	- Attendance - Performance -Literacy	- attendance and reasons for not attending -grade/level/age -repetition - can read and write

Topic	Type of Indicator	Indicators	Variables
AND NUTRITION (3)	* Input	- Nutrition - educational level of head of household and wife - Household Income - Immunization coverage - Health Education Programs - Pre-Natal Care Programs	- Average food consumption per person (for list of variables, see Nutrition below) - Availability of Food Subsidies Programs for Population at risk: Infants and Children, Pregnant and Breastfeeding Women - Children younger than one: Breastfeeding
	* Access	- Type of medical care seeked and received	private doctor, public health facility, drugstore, nurse, village medicine man, talked to a neighbor or self-medication, etc
		- Type of care delivered (office visit, hospitalization/length, surgery, etc.)	
		- Costs -	- how much paid for care - whether medicine prescribed was given or bought)
		-Geographic Access	- kind of transportation was used - how far is medical care facility
		- Degree of Satisfaction with services received:	- length respondents had to wait to be attended - how respondents evaluate care received.
	* Output	- Fertility/Birth Rates - Infant and Child Mortality Rates	To all women between 15 yrs. of age and 49 - Pregnancy? How many times? - How many children born alive? - How many children are still alive? - Age when had first child - In the last 5 yrs. lost any children younger than five? - How many? Date of birth, date, age and cause of death
		- Morbidity Rates for Adults	-symptoms
		- Morbidity Rates for Children	- symptoms - cough, diarrhea, fever
		- Nutritional/Health State of Children	- anthropometric measures: height/age (6-7 years old) and weight/age (0-5 years old).

(1) Housing and Demographic Characteristics of Population

It would be very useful if household survey data could provide information on families sharing a dwelling, to differentiate households which are composed of only one nuclear family (husband, wife and children), one nuclear family in which either the father or mother is missing, two or more unrelated individuals or two or more families sharing the same dwelling. Such information can be easily obtained when the list of household member provides information on who is the head of household, who are the heads of families (in the case of two or more families) and assigns numbers for each cluster of household members which compose a different family. Such information would allow for the analysis of changes in nuptiality patterns, changes in family composition, as well as for the identification of different strategies adopted by households, families and individuals to cope with constraints like low income, unemployment, single parenthood, etc.

(2) Education

To improve output indicators on educational performance and to support analysis of indirect costs of education for households:
- School-Age, Basic, Middle and High School, College, Graduate, Vocational, etc.: Attends School Exclusively, Attends School and Works, Attends School and Helps with Housework, Only Helps with Housework, Only Works. This can be expanded to:
> For those who attend school and work or who only work:

- How many hours of work a week?
> For those who attend school and help with housework or who only help with housework
- how many hours of housework a week?

> For all respondents who attend school:
- Home Study/Homework: how many hours a day are spent at home studying/doing homework?

Concerning Input Indicators, in Education, Housing Conditions are among the most important ones in addition to Health and Nutrition Conditions. Concerning Outcome Indicators, as mentioned earlier in this report, they measure the externalities of policies, or the improvements made in one area as an indirect result of policies and investments in another. This is particularly the case of investments in Education because studies have repeatedly shown the spillover effect of improvements in educational indicators to other areas: a better educated population has more access to better jobs - and consequently to a better income, better housing conditions and better health, better educated women show lower fertility rates, and their children show lower mortality rates, as well as lower drop-out and repetition rates in school. Therefore, the construction of outcome indicators in Education requires particularly good information in Health, as described below.

(3) HEALTH INDICATORS

Health Indicators should cover all residents and investigate general morbidity as well as specific aspects concerning groups at risk: pregnant women and women in childbearing years and children, particularly infants and pre-school age children, but also school age children. For these groups, health conditions are intrinsically related to basic sanitary conditions in the household, level of education of the head of household and, more important yet, of the women/mothers, and to the nutritional conditions which, on their turn, are highly dependent on household income. Therefore, questionnaires should investigate all these aspects. Concerning Input Indicators, the average food consumption per person (for list of variables, see Nutrition below), the availability of food subsidies programs for groups of the population at risk, breastfeeding for children younger than one, the educational level of head of household and wife, household Income. Input indicators in Health would be the coverage of programs like immunization, health education and pre-natal care.

5.2.1. Additional Important Indicators

Nutrition

Investigation of Nutrition in household surveys should be kept to a minimum due to all the methodological and operational difficulties involved in collecting the information on quantities bought, amount paid and quantities of food effectively consumed by household members in the reference period. The solution adopted in the few countries which included modules on nutrition in their household surveys is to investigate nutritional aspects which are relevant for certain groups of the population who may be at risk: pregnant women, infants and children. Meals at home and outside as well as the access to certain programs like meals provided at work, meal subsidy tickets, and school lunch programs are not difficult to investigate either.

Anthropometric measures are an effective and reasonably simple way of obtaining measures of the nutritional conditions of infants and children. Because of the relevant role it plays in early infancy as a natural provider of protection against certain conditions, breasfeeding is an important aspect to investigate concerning the nutritional conditions of infants (0-1 year old): whether infant is being breastfed, if not whether infant was, for how long, when were infants introduced to solid foods, etc.).

Pregnant women and women who are breastfeeding should be investigated concerning the intake of calcium, iron and folliculin supplements.

Income and Expenditures

As noted earlier in this report, Income-Expenditures Surveys are, in themselves, extremely difficult to implement at regular intervals because of the high costs of a lengthy operation and a complex questionnaire. The countries which opt to implement the LSMS-type survey will, in general have some information on Expenditures, although not as extensive as the information usually provided in Income-Expenditures surveys: it usually covers a smaller number of items and shorter reference periods.

Because the consumption of individual items and products varies from country to country due to their availability, price, cultural factors determining their use, etc., it is of no avail to provide a detailed list of aspects to be investigated. In general terms, however, a few recommendations on the classification of Expenditures can be made:

- Food and Non-food Consumption Expenditures
> For Food Consumption: reference periods should be the previous day and the past seven days.

> Non-Food Consumption Expenditures includes: expenditures with the consumption of durable goods (articles for the home, personal care, clothing and shoes) and expenditures with services, housing and car maintenance, education, health care, transportation, recreation and leisure, etc. Reference periods for these expenditures are usually longer, varying from 4 to 12 months.

Concerning Income, in addition to the classical variables used to investigate Income in Labor Force Surveys, the following general recommendations are in order: Income types, sources and amount should be as detailed as possible so that the best picture can be obtained. In addition, indirect income should also be included in the computation of both household and individual income. Indirect income includes savings derived from not paying rent or mortgage on a house, family remittances, loans, insurance premiums, benefits like employee-sponsored medical insurance and medical benefits, retirement plans, bonuses, transportation, etc.

Finally, an Inventory of Durable Goods in the Household like cars, refrigerators, TV sets, VCR, computers, sewing machines, motor boats, bicycles, etc., and their purchase value - as well as for how much they could be sold today - can provide an additional set of information to assess the general well-being of different population groups.

5.3. Final Remarks

Improvements in the systems of household surveys in most Latin American countries will require, in addition to financial resources and technical support, a strong commitment on the part of the governments and agencies involved. Therefore, an assessment of the institutional capacity of countries should look back into the institutional history of household survey programs in the countries, attempting to identify trends in human and budget resources assigned to the implementation of these programs. This analysis might clarify the weaknesses and strengths (both technical and institutional) of programs, guiding the actions to be implemented in each individual country [33]. Goals to be set and their order of priority may be very different in each case, depending on the areas which need more support.

This report could only provide an overview of major aspects to be considered in attempts to reformulate survey programs in Latin American countries. Implementation of the program will certain require local assessment in each country where project will be implemented. This assessment should particularly include aspects that were hardly touched upon in this report, like the coordination of field operations, the quality of field staff, coding, data entry procedures, procedures for dissemination, microdata, etc.

It must be noted that the emphasis on an ideal coverage of topics does not mean that such topics must be investigated every year at the length recommended here. It only means that countries would much benefit from investigating them at regular intervals. This can be done in several ways, the easiest one being of including supplementary questionnaires, on a rotation basis to go with the regular program of household surveys implemented in the country. For those countries already implementing the LSMS-type questionnaire, this rotational basis could significantly reduce operational costs. This requires: (a) that countries design a basic program of household surveys and implement this program on a regular basis; (b) improvements in the sample frame and a flexible enough sample design in order to maximize the information obtained for particular groups of the population who are being targetted by social policies and programs.

In addition to an assessment of each survey program operational infrastructure, an institutional diagnosis, providing additional data and information on the institutional history of each particular household survey which will be included in the ISLC program, as well on their historical trends concerning human and budget resources, frequency, data availability, etc. In the countries where very little activity exists in this area and where data is scarce, irregular and infrequent, the first step should be to begin from the beginning, supporting the implementation of a good population census where it is not done, or improvements in census operations: planning, operation, data processing and analysis.

It is also important to integrate and coordinate the actions of government agencies, the Statistical Offices, Universities, as well as users concerning financial and human resources for surveys planning and operations, training programs, etc. Such coordination is of foremost importance when it comes to the need of administrative records to back-up or to complement the analysis of household survey data. An effective system of social statistics cannot rely solely on household survey data and requires effective, good quality and timely administrative data.

Concerning the topics coverage of questionnaire, it is recommended that particularly in countries with little or irregular activity in the area of household surveys or where institutional support to the activity is unstable, could begin with the design of a very simple questionnaire, covering basically the same topics they already cover but at a greater length. Once this instrument gets institutionalized and is running smoothly, other topics could be added (Health and Health Services, Fertility and Infant Mortality, Nutrition, Expenditures and Consumption, etc.

Undoubtedly the analytical richness of data from integrated household surveys (where all the modules are applied together, at the same time, to the same sample) is much higher because of their potential for analyzing the interrelations among several socio-economic aspects all at once and their impact upon each other. However, countries which have difficulties to implement such surveys each year might benefit from doing modules on specific topics on a rotational basis, like a program of topics investigated sequentially each year so that every topic would be covered every two or three years, for instance.

[33] This point will be further explored in the final section of this report, which contains recommendations for improvement in household surveys in Latin American countries.

Although this reduces the analytical potential of survey data to show the multiple interactions of different factors in the living conditions of the population, at this point it would be better to have a more condensed topics coverage and search for improvements in the quality of the sample frame and design, of field operations and coding instruments, coding procedures, etc., leading to a sustainability of the operation, with visible impact on frequency and data availability. Once these elements are running smoothly, more complexity and detail can be added to the questionnaire content itself. A good quality and well-designed questionnaire can only offer good data if the survey infrastructure is of good quality.

Some countries, particularly the countries with a more solid experience in household surveys, might benefit from a combination of their traditional Labor Force surveys with the LSMS or the CASEN, much in the style of the experience of Jamaica. The option for one instrument or the other will be highly dependent on the reasons why the country wants to improve its system of household surveys: if there is an interest in obtaining more information for the analysis of poverty and living conditions, the LSMS will be a better choice. If, on the contrary, the country's interest is primarily in the monitoring of social investments and social programs, a CASEN-type questionnaire would be much more appropriate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ainsworth, Martha & Jacques van der Gaag (1988) **Guidelines for Adapting the LSMS Living Standards Questionnaires to Local Conditions**, Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper no. 34, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Bernstein, Boris & James M. Boughton (1993) **Adjusting to Development: the IMF and the Poor**, Washington, D.C.: IMF Paper on Policy Analysis and Assessment.

Berumen, Edmundo (1993) **Household Survey Programmes in Latin America: some aspects of sample designs currently in use in Central Statistical Offices**, Contributed Paper Meeting ST 49, International Statistical Institute, 49th Session.

Caillaux, Elisa L. (1994) **Levantamento das Variáveis que Compõem o Corpo Básico e Suplemento da PNAD nas Décadas de 1970 e 1980, da PME e do Registro Civil**, Rio de Janeiro, R.J.: Fundação IBGE, Diretoria de Pesquisas, Departamento de Estatísticas e Indicadores Sociais.

Cardoso, Eliana (1992) **Inflation and Poverty**, Cambridge, Mass: National Bureau of Economic Research, INC.

CEPAL (1983) **Las Encuestas de Hogares en America Latina**, Cuadernos de la CEPAL, no. 44, Santiago de Chile: Publicacion de las Naciones Unidas.

Glewwe, Paul & Dennis de Tray (1989) **The Poor in Latin America during Adjustment: A Case Study of Peru**, Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper no. 56, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Grosh, Margaret E. (1991) **The Household Survey as a Tool for Policy Change: Lessons from the Jamaican Survey of Living Conditions**, Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper no. 80, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

de Jong, Niek (1995) **Education, Income distribution and Poverty: a Critical Analysis of Household Survey Data of Selected Latin American Countries**, Washington, D.C.:Inter-American Development Bank, INT/SDI.

Leite, Márcia B. de Mello (1990), **Estatísticas e Indicadores Sociais para a Década de 90**, Textos para Discussão no. 19, Ric de Janeiro, R.J.: Fundação IBGE, Diretoria de Pesquisas

Melgar, Alicia T. (1994) **Programa de Consolidación de la Reforma Administrativa y Financiera del Sector Público: Fortalecimiento Institucional del INDEC**.

MIDEPLAN, Chile (1992) **Población, Educación, Vivienda, Salud, Empleo y Pobreza: CASEN 1990**, Santiago, Chile.

Monges, Fulvio et. al. (1993) **Ingresos y Politica Economica, Educacion y Empleo Agropecuario en Paraguay**, Asuncion, Paraguay: Universidad Nacional de Asuncion, Facultad de Ciencias Economicas, Administrativas y Contables.

Morley, Samuel A. & Carola Alvarez (1992a) **Poverty and Adjustment in Costa Rica**, Working Papers Series no. 123, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, Economic and Social Development Department.

Morley, Samuel A. & Carola Alvarez (1992b) **Recession and the Growth of Poverty in Argentina**, Working Papers Series no. 125, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, Economic and Social Development Department.

Morley, Samuel A. (1992c) **Policy, Structure and the Reduction of Poverty in Colombia: 1980-1989**, Working Paper Series no. 126, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, Economic and Social Development Department.

Morley, Samuel A. & Antonia Silva (1994) **Problems and Performance in Primary Education: why do systems differ?**, Washington, D.C.: The Social Agenda Policy Group, Inter-American Development Bank.

Sauma, Pablo (1993) **La Distribucion del Ingreso en el Paraguay**, Asuncion, Paraguay: Universidad Nacional de Asuncion, Facultad de Ciencias Economicas, Administrativas y Contables.

Sauma, Pablo et. al (1993) **Producción, Ingresos, Empleo y Estratificación Social en el Paraguay**, Asuncion, Paraguay: Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Administrativas y Contables.

Schwartzman, Simon (1995) **O Presente e o Futuro do IBGE**, Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Fundação IBGE.

UNDP (1994) **Human Development Report**

UNESCO (1994) **Taller regional sobre indicadores de educación para el desarollo humano**, Documento de Trabajo, Paris: UNESCO, división de Estadistica.

Vos, Robert (1992) **Hacia el Mejoramiento del Sistema de Indicadores Sociales para America Latina**, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank & Institute of Social Studies (ISS).

Vos, Robert (1995) **Educational Indicators: What_is to be Measured**, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Institute for Social Development, internal paper, not for distribution.

ANNEX I

COUNTRIES	MOST RECENT POPULATION CENSUS	PERMANENT HHS					
		Name	Type and Date Initiated	Frequency	Coverage	Sample Size Last data avlbl.	Special Modules
Argentina	1991	Encuesta Permanente de Hogares (INDEC)	LFS (since 1972)	Permanent, 2 x year, May and October	B.A. Metro and 26 urban conglomerates	1989: 4,893 hhlds. B.A.: 3,100 in 1992	1978&1988-Housing 1989 - Health
Barbados	N/A	Continuous Household Sample Survey	LFS (since 1975)	Permanent, quarterly	National: Urban and Rural	appr. 1,400 hhlds.	N/A
Belize	1991 (CSO)	Labor Force Survey (LFS) (CSO)	LFS (since 1993)	2 x year	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bolivia	1992 INE	Encuestas Integradas de Hogares (previously Encuesta Permanente de Hogares) (INE)	Multipurpose HHS based on LSMS model (Since 1989)	Permanent, 1 x year, Variable 5 rounds 1989-92. continuous since '93.	8 Capital cities plus El Alto (U)	1986: 2,788 hhlds. 1989: 7,624 hhlds. (approximately 5,000 dwellings)	
Brazil	1991 IBGE	Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicilios (PNAD) (IBGE)	Multipurpose HHS (since 1967)	Permanent 67-70: quarterly 71 on: Yearly, iv trim.	National, except for rural North	1986: 75,000 hhlds. 1993: 90,000 hhlds.	PNAD Suplements: 1973-Labor Force & Fertility 1976 - Race, Labor & Social Mobility 1977 - Housing 1981 - Health 1982 - Education 1983 - Labor & The Welfare System 1984 - Fertility 1985 - Living Cond. of Children in Metropolitan Areas 1986 - Contraceptive Practices, Access to Social Programs & Unionization/Community Participation 1988 - Social and Political Participation 1989 - Labor Force: Formal and Informal Labor Market
		Pesquisa Mensal de Emprego (P (IBGE)	LFS (since 1980)	Permanent, monthly	Metro Regions: RJ, SP, Porto Alegre, BH, Salvador, Recife	40,000 hhlds.	

Inventory of Available Census and Surveys

COUNTRIES	IES			OTHER RELEVANT SURVEYS				
	Name	Date, Frequency and Institution	Coverage	Sample Size - # Hhlds.	Name	Date	Sample Size	Coverage
Argentina			Greater B.A.	2,745 hhlds				
Barbados								
Belize	Household Expenditures Survey	every 5 yrs. (CSO)	National	n/a	Fam. Health Survey Toledo District Survey. Nutrition Survey (CSO)	1991 n/a 1993	n/a n/a n/a	n/a Local (Tol. Distr.) n/a
Bolivia	included in EIH as a module	Jan 90-Jan 91 (INE)	La Paz, El Alto Cochabamba Sta. Cruz	6,093 hhlds.	National Survey of Populatio and Housing Rural HHS (USAID) Food Consumption Survey Demogr. Health Survey (USAID)	1988 (INE) 1991 1991 1989 & 1992	43,000 hhlds. n/a n/a n/a n/a	National Cochabamba La Paz & rural National
Brazil	Pesquisa de Orcamentos Familiares (POF)	every 5 years Mar 87- Feb 88 (IBGE)	Metro Areas	n/a	National Survey on Health and Nutrition (IBGE/INAN/IPEA) LSMS	1989 pilot 1995	15,000 7,000 hhlds.	National, except for rural NE. Northeast & Southe

COUNTRIES	MOST RECENT POPULATION CENSUS	PERMANENT HHS					
		Name	Type and Date Initiated	Frequency	Coverage	Sample size # hhlds. Last data Avlbl.	Special Modules
Chile	1992 (INE)	Programa Integrado de Encuestas de Hogares (PIDEH):			Gran Santiago since 1973	Iv trim 1990	
		Encuesta Nacional del Empleo	LFS	Permanent, Quarterly (INE)	National since 1976	32,523 hhlds.	
		Encuesta de Mano de Obra y Remuneracion	LFS	monthly monthly	National National		
		Encuesta Ocupacional	LFS	monthly	National		
		Encuesta Ocupacional y Ingreso (INE)	LFS	once a yr.	Metro Area		
		Caracterizacion Socioeconomic Nacional "(MIDEPLAN)	CASEN (since 1985)	1987; 1990, 1992, 1994	National	1990: 21,480 hhlds. 1992: 27,666 hhlds.	
Colombia	1985 (DANE) 1993 (results avlbl. 94)	Encuesta Nacional de Hogares (DANE)	LFS Since 1970	Permanent, quarterly in urban areas, variable frequency in rural areas	National: Urban 1988 & 1991: Rural	1994: 18,286 dwellings Urban (7 Metropolitan Regions and 4 cities) 18,200 hhlds. 1991 - Rural (4 regions): 7,122 hhlds.	Housing - annual, since 1986 Fertility - 1971, 72, 77, 78, 80 Needs (?) - 1984 Housing & Transportation - 1978 Transportation - 1980 Informal Sector - 1984, 86, 88, 90 Food, Nutrition & Housing - 1981 TV, Energy, Pnts of Purchase - 1985 Criminality - 1985 Tourism - 1989 Health/ Job Quality - 1994
Costa Rica	1984 (DGEC)	Encuesta de Hogares de Propositos Multiples (Includes Encuesta Puntual de Empleo, Encuesta Continua de Hogares y Modulos Especiales) (DGEC)	Multipurpose HHS (since 1987) (encuestas de hogares initiated in 1965)	Permanent 1 x year, July	National: Regional Urban/Rural: groups of Regi	1986: 7,627 dwellings 1989: 7,637 dwellings 1993: 8,696dwellings 1994: 9,736 dwellings	Housing - 1989, 92, 94 Access to Health Services - 1990, 93 Insurance - 1988/94 - yearly Fat Intake - 1990 Anthropometric Measures - 1992 Breasfeeding - 1990, 94 Senior citizens - 1994 Working children - 1994
Dom. Rep.	1993 (OCE)	Encuesta Nacional de Hogares (Central Bank)	LFS (since 1991)	Permanent, 2 x year	National	n/a	

Inventory of Available Census and Surveys, (cont.)

COUNTRIES	IES				OTHER RELEVANT SURVEYS			
	Name	Date, Frequency and Institution	*Coverage	Sample Size Last Data Available	Name	Date	Sample Size (#hhlds) Last Data Avlbl.	Coverage
Chile		Dec 87 - Nov 88 (INE)	Gran Santiago	5,076 hhlds.				
Colombia	Encuesta de Ingresos y Gastos	Mar 84-Feb 85 (DANE) 1994-95	15 main cities	28,704 hhlds.	Multisectoral Survey (Social Publ. Expend.) (DNP) CASEN Encuesta de Calidad de Vida	1994 1993 1993	n/a Urban: 22,125 hhlds Rural: 1,620 hhlds.	n/a National and Bogota
Costa Rica		Nov. 87 - Nov. 88 (DGEC)	National	4,884 hhlds.				
Dominican Republic		Irregular Freq. 1984, 1992 1993 (Central Bank)	National	n/a	Encuesta Demografica y de Salud (Tufts University) Encuesta de Consumo y Nutricion (UNDP) Encuesta de Gastos Sociales	1986 1989	n/a n/a	National National

COUNTRIES	MOST RECENT POPULATION CENSUS	HHS					
		Name	Type and Date Initiated	Frequency	Coverage	Sample size # hhlds. Last data Avlbl.	Special Modules
Ecuador	1990 (INEC)	Encuesta Permanente de Hogares (initiated in 1988 as Encuesta de Hogares, LFS, urban	Multipurpose HHS (Since 1987)	Permanent, 2 x year Annual at var. dates (INEM/INEC)	National (from 1990 on) Regional (serra y costa) 1987: Quito, Cuenca & Guayaquil 1988: National Urban 1989: National Urban 1990: National Rural 1991-94: National Urban	Jul 93: 4,491 hhlds. 11,237 hhlds. 11,829 hhlds. 1994: 9,180 dwellings	Health - 1988-1990 Fertility - 1988-1990 Housing, Services - 1988-1990 Education - 1987- 1994 Capacitation - 1988-1991 Demographic charact. - 1987-1994
El Salvador	1992 (DGEC/USAID)	Encuesta de Hogares de Propositos Multiples (EHPM) (MIPLAN)	Multipurpose HHS (Since ?)	Permanent, Annual Variable dates Since....	Urban National in 1992.	1991: 6,321	
Guatemala	1995 (INE) (previous one done in 1981)	Encuesta Nacional Sociodemografica (since 1986)	LFS	Planned for every 2 yrs. Not Permanent Collected at var. dates (INE)	Metro Area of Guatemala City	1990: 10,900 hhlds.	
Guyana	1992-93	Living Standards Measurement Survey (WB)	LSMS	Not institutionalized, 1994 round in discussion	National		
Haiti	1982 (IHEI)						
Honduras	1988 (DGEC)	Encuesta Continua sobre Fuerza de Trabajo Encuesta Permanente de Hogares de Propositos Multiples (EPHPM)	LFS (Since 1986) Multipurpose HHS (DGEC) (Since 1989)	Permanent, 2x yr, March & Sept.	Urban: 16 major cities Rural: 7 regional strata	1988: 8,450 hhlds. 1989: 8,648 hhlds. (4,394 urban + 4,254 rura 1992: 4,757 hhlds 1993: 7,200 dwellings	Consumption - 1991, 92, 93 Consumption of Basic Grains - 1989 Women in the Labor Force - 1990 May Demand for Rural Labor Force - 1990 S Perceptions Regarding Salaries - 1991
Jamaica		Labor Force Survey (STATIN) Jamaican Survey of Living Conditions	LFS (Since 1988) LSMS	Quarterly (since the early 80's Annual		6,000 hhlds. per round 4,485 hhlds.	

COUNTRIES	IES			OTHER RELEVANT SURVEYS			
	Date and Frequency	Coverage	Sample Size Last Data Avlbl.	Name	Date	Sample Size (#hhlds) Last Data Avlbl.	Coverage
Ecuador	Jul. 75- Jun 76: Urban Sept. 78-Oct. 79: Rural Sept-Nov 1991 1995 -Central Bank/ USAID (planned)	Urban Rural National: Urban	9,606 hhlds. 4,200 hhlds. 5,039 hhlds.	Encuesta Nacional de Fecundidad (INEC/ISI) Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida - LSMS	1979 1994		National (except for the Amazon Region and the Province of Galapagos) National
El Salvador	1992 (MIPLAN)	Urban	3,536 hhlds.				
Guatemala	Nov 79 - Aug. 81	National	9,688 hhlds.	Necesidades Basicas Insatisfechas Encuesta Nacional de Consum Aparente de Alimentos	1981 1991	n/a n/a	National & Regional
Guyana	1992-1993 Not Permanent			National Food & Nutrition Survey (PAHO) Surv. of Needs of Women in Selected Coastal Communities (UNDP) Rural Social and Economic Survey (IICA - IFAD - IDS/ University of Guyana)	1976 1990 1994	n/a n/a	
Haiti	HH Expend. Survey 1976 (IHEI)	Metro Area Port-au-Prince	n/a				
Honduras	1978-1979 (DGEC)	Urban	n/a	Prevalence of Contraception (DGEC)	1981		
Jamaica	Every 5 yrs.						

COUNTRIES	MOST RECENT POPULATION CENSUS	HHS					
		Name	Type and Date Initiated	Frequency	Coverage	Sample Size Last Data Avlbl.	Special Modules
Mexico	1990 (INEGI)	Encuesta Nacional de Empleo Urba (since 1985)	LFS	Permanent, Quarterly (INEGI)	Urban: 3rd. trim. 1992 covers approx. 97% of population in urban centers with at least 100,000 pop.size	38,388 hhlds.	
Nicaragua	1972 (1995?)	Encuesta Nacional de Hogares sobre Medicion de Nivel de Vida (INEC/WB)	LSMS (less agric. module) 1993	not permanent	National: Urban & Rural Managua + 6 regions	1993 4,200 hlds.	
Panama	1990 (DEC)	Encuestas Anuales de Hogares	LFS	Permanent,, once a year in August (DEC)	National	1993: about 10,000, excluding indigenous populations and rural workers self-employed or employers	1982 - Lactation 1987 - Agricultural Employment 1989 - Crisis Impact
Paraguay	1992 (DGEC)			Permanent, yearly at var. times	Metro Area of Asuncion	1,052 hhlds.	
Peru	1993 (INEI)	Encuesta Nacional de Hogares sobre Medicion de Niveles de Vida (Cuanto S.A.)	LSMS	3 rounds (85/86, 90, 91)	National, Urban and Rural, Regional	1985/86: 5,024 hhlds. 1994: 3.600 dwellings	Housing, Education, Health, Consumption, Econ. Activity, Dem. Charact., Migration, Household business:1985-86, 90,91, 94 Fertility - 1985-86, 1994 Nutrition - 1994 Food Programs - 1991, 1994
Suriname	1980			ONGs., no institutional-ized frequency			
Trin & Tob.	1990 every ten yrs.	Continuous Sample Survey of Population	LFS	Quarterly (since 1983)	National: Urban and Rural	1994: 2,700 hhlds.	
Uruguay	1985 (DGEC) (1995 in preparation)	Encuesta Continua de Hogares (INE - Since 1968)	LFS	Permanent, 2 x year	Urban	1988: 9,470 hhlds. in Montevideo & 12,003 hhlds. in the interior 1992: 9,282 Montevideo 1994: 19,200 urban hhlds.	1986 - Housing and House Lease 1989/90 - Youth
Venezuela	1990 (OCEI)	Encuesta de Hogares por Muestra (since 1967)	LFS	Permanent, 2 x yr	National: Urban & Rural	1989: 61,365 hhlds. 1992: 62 775 hhlds.	1987 - Victimization, 1987 - 2nd. Job 1987 Child Care

COUNTRIES	IES			OTHER RELEVANT SURVEYS			
	Date and Frequency	Coverage	Sample Size (# hhlds) Last Data Avlbl	Name	Date	Sample Size (# hhlds) Last Data Avlbl.	Coverage
Mexico	1992 every 5 yrs.	National 65% of hhlds. in urban areas	13,650 hhlds.	Encuesta Nacional de Economia Informal	1991		
Nicaragua	May 84-Jun 85 Sample size n/a (INEC)	Managua	n/a				
Panama	1983 Every ten yrs. (next one planned for 1996)	National		Encuesta Nacional de Nutricion (MS)	1980		
				Encuesta de Condicion de Vida de la Ciudad de Panama y del distrito de San Miguelito	Apr. 83-Mar 84 (DEC)	1,070	Panama City and San Miguelito
				Encuesta Nacional Materno-Infantil (MS)	1984		
				Encuesta Nacional de Consum Canasta Basica de Alimentos	1991		Metro Region and the rest of the country
				Encuesta sobre Salud Mater Infantil y Planificacion Familiar (MS)	1993-94		
				Encuesta de Condicion de Vida (LSMS)	Pilot in 1995, survey in 1996		
Paraguay	Encuesta de Presupuestos Familiares (Central Bank)	Urban: 2,500 hhlds. (Gran Asuncion y resto urbano)	1991	Caracterizacion Socio-Economi de las Familias Paraguayas	1992	5,059 hhlds.	National
Peru				ENAPROM	1985-86, 1988	n/a	
				Nat. Rural HH Survey (USAID	1984	n/a	
				National Survey on Health and Nutrition	1984	15,662 women	National
				Consumption	1990	648 hhlds.	National
				Dem. Health Survey (DHS)	1991	n/a	
Suriname	***			Infreq. studies on health and nutrition, feeding practices			
Trin.& Tob.	Household Budget Survey (1988) evr. 4 yrs.	National		Survey on Living Conditions	1992	1,467 hhlds.	
Uruguay	Aug 82 - Sept 83 (DGEC) 1994 in execution	Urban	4,000 hhlds.				
Venezuela	Apr 88 - Mar 89 (OCEI & Central Bank)	Urban (in localities w/ 10,000 people and over	8,280 hhlds	Encuesta Social (LSMS) (1991)			

Table 2 - Countries by Basic Coverage of Topics

ountries	Type of Survey	Dwelling & HH. Charact.	Demogr. Charact. of HH Members: All HH Members	Demogr. Charact. of HH Members: Only HH Heads	Occupation	Income: Total (6)	Income: Partial	Education	Health	Nutrition	Fertility & Inf. Mort.	Migration	Expend. & Cons.
rgentina	(EPH) HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	x	-
arbados (1)	CHSS (LFS)	-	x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
elize	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/n	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
olivia	EPH 1986	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
razil	PNAD 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
hile	(PIDEH) HHS 1989	-	-		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
olombia	HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
osta Rica (*)	EHPM		x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
om. Republic (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
cuador (2)	EPH 1988	x	x		x	no	labor	x	x	-	-	-	-
Salvador (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	-
uatemala (*)	EPH	x	x		x	no	labor, pension	x	x	-	-		-
uyana (3)	LSMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
aiti	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/n	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/n
nduras	Mult HHS 1989	x	x		x	no	labor	x	x	-	-	-	x
maica	LSMS (1993)	x	x		x	yes		x	x	x	-	-	-
exico	ENEU	x	x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
caragua (4)	LSMS	x	x		x	yes		x	x	x	-	x	-
nama (*)	EPH	-	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
raguay (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
ru (5)	LSMS	x	x		x	no	labor, pension	x	x	x	-	-	x
riname	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/n	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n & Tob.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/n	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
uguay	HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
nezuela	HHS 1989	x	x		x	no	labor, transfers	x	x	-	-	-	x
										-	-	-	-

ntes:

Information was extracted from table provided by Jacques Arias based on CEPAL data and from questionnaires analyzed in paper

Questionnaire for Barbados is very short and does not keep the same format as that of the Labor Force or Employment/Unemployment Survey as in other countries

Ecuador has started a program of LSMS in 1992. Data on table refers to Health Supplement to 1988 EPH and was obtained from the material quoted in no. (*) above

Questionnaire for Guyana not available. Inclusion of non-institutionalized LSMS is a result of unavailability of other surveys

Although Nicaragua had only 1 round of LSMS and does not have the program institutionalized, it was included here because no other surveys are available

Peru's LSMS was done by a private firm and seems to be rather irregular.

(6) In most cases, income from labor, property/rent, pensions, transfers and capital.

Most countries, however, collect this information with different levels of aggregation, for instance, in some cases, income from labor is one category and income from all other sources is another.

Most countries, except for Chile and Uruguay, do not compute imputed income from

Table 1 – Countries by Basic Coverage of Topics

Countries	Type of Survey	Dwelling & HH. Charact.	Demogr. Charact. of HH Members		Occupation	Income		Education	Health	Nutrition	Fertility & Inf. Mort.	Migration	Expend. & Cons.
			All HH Members	Only HH Heads		Total (6)	Partial						
Argentina	(EPH) HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	x	-
Barbados (1)	CHSS (LFS)	-	x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
Belize	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bolivia	EPH 1986	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
Brazil	PNAD 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
Chile	(PIDEH) HHS 1989	-	-		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
Colombia	HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
Costa Rica (*)	EHPM		x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
Dom. Republic (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	-	-	-	-	-
Ecuador (2)	EPH 1988	x	x		x	no	labor	x	x	-	-	-	-
El Salvador (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	-
Guatemala (*)	EPH	x	x		x	no	labor, pension	x	x	-	-		-
Guyana (3)	LSMS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Haiti	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Honduras	Mult HHS 1989	x	x		x	no	labor	x	x	-	-	-	x
Jamaica	LSMS (1993)	x	x		x	yes		x	x	x	-	-	-
Mexico	ENEU	x	x		x	no	labor	x	-	-	-	-	-
Nicaragua (4)	LSMS	x	x		x	yes		x	x	x	-	x	-
Panama (*)	EPH	-	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
Paraguay (*)	EPH	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
Peru (5)	LSMS	x	x		x	no	labor, pension	x	x	x	-	-	x
Suriname	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Trin & Tob.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Uruguay	HHS 1989	x	x		x	yes		x	x	-	-	-	x
Venezuela	HHS 1989	x	x		x	no	labor, transfers	x	x	-	-	-	x
										-	-	-	-

Footnotes:

(*) Information was extracted from table provided by Jacques Anas based on CEPAL data and from questionnaires analyzed in paper

(1) Questionnaire for Barbados is very short and does not keep the same format as that of the Labor Force or Employment/Unemployment Survey as in other countries

(2) Ecuador has started a program of LSMS in 1992. Data on table refers to Health Supplement to 1988 EPH and was obtained from the material quoted in note (*) above

(3) Questionnaire for Guyana not available. Inclusion of non-institutionalized LSMS is a result of unavailability of other surveys

(4) Although Nicaragua had only 1 round of LSMS and does not have the program institutionalized, it was included here because no other surveys are available

(5) Peru's LSMS was done by a private firm and seems to be rather irregular.

(6) In most cases, income from labor, property/rent, pensions, transfers and capital. Most countries, however, collect this information with different levels of aggregation, for instance, in some cases, income from labor is one category and income from all other sources is another. Most countries, except for Chile and Uruguay, do not compute imputed income from owning the dwelling.

Table 3.

Topics and Indicators (**)	Countries													
	Bahamas, Belize, Costa Rica, Guyana Haiti,Mexico, Suriname, Trin. & Tobago	Barbados	Brazil	Colombia	Domin. Republ.	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras	Jamaica (***) (LFS)	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Venezuela (Encuesta social)
I - Housing	questionnaire n/a	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
· Material/conditions		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
· Density		-	++	++	++	++	-	++	++	++	++	-	+	++
· Kitchen		-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-
· Sanitation		-	++	++	++	+	+	++	++	+	++	-	+	++
Water		-	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Sewerage		-	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	+	++	-	+	++
II - Education	questionnaire n/a													
nput Indicators:														
Nutrition		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Health		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+
Housing		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Educ. Level HH Head/Wife		-	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++
Access Indicators:														
distance		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
type (public/private)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
· costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
non-attend. due to work		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Output Indicators:														
Literacy Rates		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Attendance		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Attainment - gr/level		+ (cap.)	++	++	+ (cap.)	++	+ (cap.)	+ (cap.)	+ level	+ level	+ (cap.)	+ level	+ level	++
Schooling Rates		+	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++
Repetition		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Outcome Indicators:														
Health		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+(children)	+
Income		-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+		+	+

Topics and Indicators (**)	Countries													
	Bahamas, Belize, Costa Rica, Guyana Haiti,Mexico, Suriname, Trin. & Tobago	Barbados	Brazil	Colombia	Domin. Republ.	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras	Jamaica (***) (LFS)	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Venezuela (Encuesta socio
III - Health	questionnaire n/a													
nput Indicators:	a													
ncome		+	+	+	-	+	+	+		+	+		+	+
lutrition		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
mmun. coverage		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
lousing/Sanitation		-	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	+	+
Access Indicators:														
Physical - geogr. dist.		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Costs		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
Type/quality Service		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
Output Indicators:	questionnaire n/a													
Mortality Rates - general		-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mortality Rates - Inf/child		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Fertility Rates		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Birth Rates		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Morbidity		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Life Expectancy		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Outcome Indicators:														
Inc. diseases		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
School/work absenteeism		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Topics and Indicators (**)	Countries													
	Bahamas, Belize, Costa Rica, Guyana Haiti,Mexico, Suriname, Trin. & Tobago	Barbados	Brazil	Colombia	Domin. Republ.	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Honduras	Jamaica (***) (LFS)	Nicaragua	Panama	Peru	Venezuela (Encuesta social)
IV - Nutrition	questionnaire n/a													
Input Indicators:		-												
Food consumption		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Programs Pop. at Risk		-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Access:														
Family/household Income		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Food Availability		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Output Indicators:														
Anthropom. Measures		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Health conditions		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Outcome Indicators:														
School Attainment		+	++	++	++	+	+	+	+(level)	+	+	-	+	+
Schoool Performance		-		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
V - Income	questionnaire n/a	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
VI -Occupation/ Labor force	questionnaire n/a	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
VII - Migration	questionnaire n/a	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+

*) - Countries analyzed in Part
i were not included in this table

**) Conventions for Coverage:
no coverage
- -some coverage
+ - good coverage

***) Coverage of LSMS basically follows LSMS structure

Topics and Indicators (**)	Selected Countries: Argentina	Bolivia	Chile CASEN	Uruguay	Paraguay SES
I - Housing					
- Material/conditions	+	-	-	-	+
- Density	-	-	-	-	+
- Kitchen	-	+	-	+	+
- Own or Rent	+	+	-	+	+
- Sanitation			-	+	+
Water	-	+	-	+	+
Sewerage	-	+	+	+	+
Garbage Coll/Disp.	-	-	-	-	+
II - Education					
Input Indicators:					
Nutrition	-	+	-	-	
Health	-	-	-	-	
Housing		+	--	+	+
Educ. Level HH Head/Wife	+	+	-	+	+
Access Indicators:					
- distance	-	+	+	-	+
- type (public/private)	-	+	-	-	+
- costs	-	+	(vouchers?)	-	-
- non-attend. due to work	-	+	+	-	+
Output Indicators:					
Literacy Rates	+	-	+	-	
Attendance	+	+	+	+	+
Attainment - gr/level	only level	+	+	+	+
Schooling Rates		+	+	+	+
Repetition	-	-	-	-	-
Outcome Indicators:					
Health	-	+	-	-	-
Income	+	-	-	+	+
III - Health					
Input indicators:					
Income	-	+	-	+	+
Nutrition	-	-	(children15 -)	-	-
Immun. coverage	-	-	-	-	-
Housing/Sanitation		-	+	+	+
Access Indicators:				only use	
Physical - geogr. dist.	-	-	+	of service	+
Costs	-	+	+	-	-
Type/quality Service	-	+	+	-	-
Output Indicators:					
Mortality Rates - general	-	-	-	-	-
Mortality Rates - Inf/child	-	-	-	-	-
Fertility Rates	-	-	-	-	-
Birth Rates	-	-	-	-	-
Morbidity	-	-	+	-	-
Life Expectancy	-	+		-	-
Outcome Indicators:					
Inc. diseases	-	-	-	-	-
School/work absenteeism	-	-	-	-	-

Summary of coverage of selected topics and indicators (*)

Topics and Indicators (**)	Selected Countries				
	Argentina	Bolivia	Chile CASEN	Uruguay	Paraguay SES
IV - Nutrition					
Input Indicators:					
Food consumption	-	+	-	-	-
Programs Pop. at Risk	-	+	-	-	-
Access:					
Family/household Income	-		+	-	+
Food Availability	-	+	-	-	Agric. areas)
Output Indicators:					
Anthropom. Measures	-	+	-	-	-
Health conditions	-	+	+	-	+
Outcome Indicators:					
School Attainment	-	+	-		+
V - Income	+	+	-	-	+
VI -Occupation/ Labor force	+	+	+	+	-
VII - Migration	-	+	-	+	-

Conventions for Coverage:

- no coverage

+ -some coverage

COMMENTS

Gláucio Ary Dillon Soares
*DATA*UnB

The paper by Márcia Leite Arieira, *Household Surveys in Latin America and the Caribbean: an Assessment*, provides us with an exhaustive evaluative description of the contents and methodology of HHS in the area. The paper shows that HHS in the area differ in many ways, such as regularity, sampling frame and design, focus, coverage , measurement etc. These differences make comparative work in the area illustrative at best.

Arieira's data also show that, although the major *foci* of the information that is sought varies, the instruments include questions on common areas thereby making some sort of comparisons possible. Therefore, the question is: can comparisons among countries in the region be expanded to cover more areas and can comparability be improved?

This is not at the core of Arieira's concerns:

> "...intra-country comparison across regions and over time should be prioritized over inter-countries comparison. (p. 27)"

I understand Arieira fear of seeing series that are *internally* comparable interrupted and comparability disrupted. However, this is not a zero-sum model and international comparability can be achieved *without* loss in internal comparability. Furthermore, priorities in data gathering by public agencies are not set exclusively nor predominantly by the agencies' technicians, nor should they.

MERCOSUL is a success. The absolute and relative growth of trade within the area, the growing number of tourists, of migrants within the area and the beginnings of an academic response through the establishing of disciplines dealing with the area and even of a doctoral program at UFRGS, unless halted, will put pressure on the agencies in the area to provide more and better data and information. The question is not *if* this should be done, but one of how to best accomplish this.

Facilitating Comparative Work

Extreme specialization is losing favor in information-gathering agencies in the developed world. The benefits of the relational data banks that have been built are convincing. It is, of course, wasteful and time consuming to put together information that was gathered separately, sometimes by the same agency, when it could be gathered together.

Multi-purpose surveys are here to stay. They have offered the highest returns. They attract most external users. Elsewhere, they have strenghtened and even generated new disciplines. When I and the many colleagues that I have talked to about the subject think about comparative work in the region, this is what we have in mind.

Therefore, the thrust will be to organize international surveys, multi-purpose in nature, that will tackle the growing number of problem areas in Latin America and the Caribbean in general, and in MERCOSUL in particular[1]. This can be done at a relatively small cost. An item-by-item analysis of current survey questionnaires may produce several items that have zero and close-to-zero usefulness.

I feel that standardization will begin at the questionnaire level and then expand to frequency and sampling, among others. To assure comparability and maximum use, a module of basic data in different areas should be provided in very specific categories, so that comparable collapsing of categories will be possible.

External Constraints in the use of HHS by social and political scientists in Latin America

One of the major limitations in the use of survey-type data in Latin America derives from its training requirements. Few people with a college degree in the social and political Sciences are qualified to begin this task. Even graduate programs now fail to turn out trained people, prepared to competently handle quantitative data.

Traditionally, due to interest and the training required by the discipline, economists and demographers have been the main users of HHS in Latin America[2]; followed, at a great distance, perhaps by

[1] All South American countries certainly should participate. Chile and Venezuela are negotiating their status in MERCOSUL; I feel that others will soon do likewise.

[2] Elsa Berquó, analizando 331 trabalhos da ABEP, encontrou 25 que usavam a PNAD. De 12.200 trabalhos que existiam na DOCPOP, 12% usavam 12% usavam o Censo Demográfico, as PNADs e o Registro Civil. Ver Ana Amélia Camarano, "Informações demográfica: o que se tem, o que se usa e como se usa?". RBEP, vol. 7, n. 2, jul/dez. 1990. Os sociólogos e cientistas políticos que usaram a PNAD são poucos.

sociologists, political scientists, educators and the health professions. In the social and political Sciences, the use is limited: Due to the contributions of a relatively small number of fellowship programs and institutions, the 60's and 70's witnessed a growth in the number of social science professionals who were able to, and interested in, competently handling quantitative data. This trend seems to have been reversed in the 80's and 90's. In some institutions, students currently can and do obtain a doctorate without being able to *read* relatively simple statistics, let alone use them. Actually, there are programs which do not require *any* proficiency in statistics. This is not a Brazilian deficiency: it is a Latin American phenomenon.

Thus the pool of potential, external users of HHS in the social and political sciences is rather narrow, largely due to incompetence to handle even simple statistics. If output, and hopefully outcomes, are to grow, policies must be enforced that will train potential users first. In the academic world, I see this happening in four different ways:

retraining of current graduate degree holders, particularly those who teach in graduate programs;

progressive substitution of, or additions to , the current faculty teaching in graduate programs in the Social Sciences, with the purpose of changing the characters of these programs and making them more useful to the society which pays for them;

creation of new graduate programs in the Social Sciences particularly designed to train social scientists able to handle quantitative data and

a program of fellowships abroad, designed to train social scientists at the doctoral level, able to expertly handle quantitative data.

I am skeptical of the first two. Retraining requires a humbleness and a willingness to admit lack of knowledge that I fear is not there, as well as institutional requirements, such as training leaves, that are not easy to obtain. New programs, designed to train new students, do not have to face the internal opposition that attempts to modify old programs have. External fellowships may be the easiest way, but to train the kinds of numbers that would be needed to make use of HHS standard practice it would be costly.

If use is to go beyond economists and demographers, it is imperative that new training programs be created and supported. Fellowship programs designed to support students willing to use HHS data for their theses and dissertations should be created and some may be able to operate in the framework of existing training programs.

Data Distribution

Lack of training of outside users is only *one* of the factors reducing utilization of HHS data. *Distribution and availability* have been major problems. Qualified individual users, who could account for a significant proportion of all analyses, are hindered in their attempts to use HHS data due to overwhelming bureaucratic requirements. Data distribution policies must have these users in mind.

What *media*? I hypothesize that current users rely largely on PC's for the analysis of smaller data sets. This means having the data available on 3.5 1.44 diskettes. Larger data sets can be assessed by a much smaller number of users if stored in QIC's. Few have 4mm by 90mm equipment. The recent growth of CD ROM's and, more recently, of read-and-write CD's opens a new avenue for data distribution.

What *format*? My suggestion is to distribute the data sets in any format that is readable by existing, often-used statistical packages. SAS and SPSS seem to be the most common ones in the Social Sciences, perhaps with SYSTAT and BMD next. Many use spreadsheets, such as EXCEL, but spreadsheets have known inefficiencies handling large sets of data.

Ideally, data sets would be distributed in a limited number of common formats, such as TXT, DBF etc. that may be easily and safely imported by their favorite statistical packages.

Cost is another consideration. If we think of external users as unpaid collaborators, which, in many senses, they are, free distribution is easily justified and clearly is low investment/high return. If, for some bureaucratic reason, data must be sold, let it be sold at reproduction cost to Latin American institutions and individual researchers. Surely, graduate students should be able to use them free of charge.

Multi-level data can be provided by agencies with relatively little effort. The need derives from the knowledge that the behavior of individuals varies with characteristics of the broader units to which they belong. Schools, neighborhoods, countries etc have shown, through the use of context-analytic techniques to influence behavior *in addition to*, and sometimes *in interaction with*, individual attributes. Data sets can be

organized so as to include not only individual data, but aggregate data on the *município, estado, região* and, in the case of MERCOSUL, of course, nation.

Final Comment

The paper by Arieira is a competent and extremely useful piece. As an end-user seriously interested in comparative work in Latin America and the Caribbean, I now have a useful guide of what is out there, its potentialities and limitations.